

THE RUSSIAN REVIEW



*An American Quarterly
Devoted to Russia
Past and Present*

O C T O B E R

1960

Vol. 19, No. 4

Price \$1.25

THE RUSSIAN REVIEW

An American Quarterly Devoted to Russia Past and Present

Vol. 19

October, 1960

No. 4

☆ ☆ ☆

Russia Between East and West, <i>William Henry Cham-</i> <i>berlin</i>	309
Russian Marxism and Its Populist Background: The Late Nineteenth Century, <i>Richard Pipes</i>	316
The Literary Importance of Khlebnikov's Longer Poems, <i>Vladimir Markov</i>	338
Charles Darwin and Russian Scientists, <i>James Allen Rogers</i>	371
Soviet Agricultural Reform and the Future of Collective Farms, <i>Josef Kalvoda</i>	384

BOOK REVIEWS

Peaceful Co-Existence: An Analysis of Soviet Foreign Policy, by W. W. Kulski, <i>Charles Malik</i>	396
The Soviet Bloc: Unity and Conflict, by Zbigniew K. Brzezinski, <i>Cyril E. Black</i>	399
Between War and Peace: The Potsdam Conference, by Her- bert Feis, W. W. Kulski	400
The Influence of French Symbolism on Russian Poetry, by Georgette Donchin, <i>Vladimir Markov</i>	402
Government, Law and Courts in the Soviet Union and East- ern Europe, ed. by V. Gzovski and K. Grzybowski, <i>G. Guins</i>	404

Continued on Page II

The Soviet Union and the Middle East, <i>by</i> Walter Z. Laqueur, <i>Serge A. Zenkovsky</i>	406
Soviet Russia and Indian Communism: 1917-1947, <i>by</i> David N. Druhe, <i>Richard L. Park</i>	407
Pan-Turkism and Islam in Russia, <i>by</i> Serge A. Zenkovsky, <i>Amin Banani</i>	408
<i>Mosty (Bridges)</i> , Vol. 2, 1959, <i>Vera Sandomirsky</i>	410
Contributors to this Issue	413
Index to Volume 19	414
Publications Received	419

THE RUSSIAN REVIEW

Dimitri von Mohrenschildt
Editor

William Henry Chamberlin
Ralph T. Fisher, Jr.

Warren B. Walsh
Alexis Wiren

Serge A. Zenkovsky

The purpose of *The Russian Review* is to interpret the real aims and aspirations of the Russian people, as distinguished from and opposed to Soviet Communism, and to advance general knowledge of Russian culture, history and civilization. The Review invites contributions by authors of divergent views, but the opinions expressed in any individual article of this journal are not necessarily those of the editors.

Copyright 1960 by the Russian Review, Inc., 235 Baker Library, Hanover, N. H. Published quarterly in January, April, July and October. Second-class postage paid at Hanover, N. H. and at additional mailing offices. Subscription rates: \$5.00 a year in the United States; Canada \$5.50; foreign \$6.00; single issues through Vol. 12, \$1.00; subsequent single issues \$1.25. Cumulative Index to Vols. I-X (Nov. 1941-Oct. 1951), \$.75 per copy. The contents of this publication cannot be reprinted without permission of the editors. Unsolicited manuscripts will not be returned unless accompanied by stamped, self-addressed envelopes.

Russia Between East and West

By WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

The brilliant and imaginative Russian historian Kluchevsky remarks that Russia is subject both to the harsh winds of Asia and the mild winds of Europe. This is true figuratively as well as literally. Much of the drama, many of the peculiar characteristics of Russian history are explained by the fact that Russia occupies a middle position between East and West, politically and culturally as well as geographically.

Some of the early influences on the Kiev and the later Muscovite state were distinctly Eastern in character. Russia took its religion from the Byzantine Empire, a fact which was to be of profound significance in the later course of Russian development, especially in connection with its relations with Poland. The rulers of the Kiev state were also in continual contact, by trade and war, with the nomads of the Eastern steppes. Early in the thirteenth century the Tatar conquest imposed on Russia for almost two centuries dependence on an Asian form of government.

Until the sixteenth century landlocked Muscovite Russia, shut off from Western Europe by Poland and Lithuania, was very little and very dimly known to the nations of Western Europe. When a German roving envoy like Baron Herberstein or English "merchant-adventurers" like Fletcher and Jenkinson penetrated the frontiers of the Muscovite state they carried away the impression of a method of government and administration more like Turkey than that of England, France or Germany, of an absolutism unchecked and arbitrary beyond anything known in Europe.

Partly because of the Asiatic contacts and influences which predominated in the early Muscovite period, partly because of the hard struggle involved in gradually getting rid of the Tatar yoke, partly because of the isolated location of the country, with no convenient routes of communication with the West,

Russia missed many of the restraining and balancing forces that made government in the West less absolute than a Tatar khanate or a Turkish sultanate. For instance, there were few free cities, with autonomous privileges and wide-ranging contacts with foreign lands. Ivan III and Vasili III quickly liquidated the old liberties of Pskov and Novgorod.

The European feudal system, which gave the nobles certain traditional rights, even against the Crown, never took root in Russia. The Tsar's will was absolute, over the boyar of ancient family as over the humblest peasant serf. Nor was the Orthodox Church, deep as was its influence on the life of the country, a counterbalancing force against secular absolutism. The Byzantine tradition, which the Russian Church took over, was one of political passivity, of unquestioning obedience to the supreme secular power. After the fall from favor of the strong-willed Patriarch Nikon, in the middle of the seventeenth century, the Church became a regulated department of the state.

There is considerable symbolism in an anecdote told of the experience of a British envoy at the court of Ivan the Terrible. The ruthless autocrat ordered one of his boyars to jump out of a window under such circumstances that death would be the certain result. He then turned to the British envoy and asked whether the Queen of England had such authority as he had just shown. (The boyar's prompt obedience was understandable, in view of the fact that a more lingering and painful death would have awaited him if he had remonstrated or refused.) The pragmatic reply of the Briton was that Her Majesty had better uses for the necks of her subjects. And Elizabeth's famous declaration to the House of Commons toward the end of her reign that she prided herself most on having won their love, would have seemed ignoble, perhaps incomprehensible to Ivan, who seems to have felt that his subjects were honored in being made the victims of his orgies of terrorist cruelty.

Even under Ivan, however, Western contacts, at least in the form of trade, began to increase. And during the seventeenth century, not only under the famous Peter the Great, the Tsar iconoclast, innovator and modernizer, but under his less known predecessor, Aleksei Mikhailovich, Russia began to emerge from

its oriental seclusion. Something of Arnold Toynbee's theory of challenge and response found an illustration.

The Muscovite state as early as the time of Ivan the Terrible had begun to wage wars against more advanced peoples in the West, such as the Poles and the Swedes. The Russian advantage in manpower was often nullified by the superior military organization of its enemies. So there was an impulse to learn more of Western drill, tactics and weapons. A number of Scotch soldiers of fortune, among whom Patrick Gordon was perhaps the most distinguished, set about transforming the former Russian disorderly levies into a more modern military force.

Peter the Great (1688-1725) was the most potent Westernizer of all. Breaking completely with the ceremonial Byzantine traditions of the court, he roamed about Western Europe trying his hand at shipbuilding, and he set about remolding Russia from top to bottom. His new capital, St. Petersburg, laid out along Western lines and dominated by the high spire of the Admiralty (Peter was determined to end Russia's landlocked position) was the symbol and memorial of his life work.

Peter established a regular German-style bureaucracy, with a table of ranks, for the former administrative system, with its privileges of rank. He imported foreign specialists right and left, founded the Academy of Science, waged with barbarous methods a ruthless war against the inherited sloth and backwardness and barbarism of a largely Asiatic past.

The always perceptive Kluchevsky speaks of Peter's labors as an attempt to square the circle, to make men who were still enslaved act as if they were free. Impressive as Peter's designs and some of his achievements were, their effect was largely confined to a limited class of the officialdom and the aristocracy. The bonds on the peasant serfs were riveted more tightly than ever, because Peter, like certain more recent rulers of Russia, was so intent on moving a poor country forward materially rapidly that he exacted the last kopeck in taxes from the masses at the bottom of the social pyramid. Both his wars and his program of public improvements pressed hard on the masses of his subjects.

As Russia's contacts with the West increased and it emerged

more and more as an essential partner in the concert of European powers, Western traits and characteristics pushed Eastern into the background. An upper class that made a practice of providing foreign governesses for its children became an upper class apt to be fluent in French, English and German. Russian students began to appear in foreign universities, especially in Germany.

Nikolai Rostov and his fellow-officers in Tolstoy's *War and Peace* do not impress the reader as very different in character and tastes from Captain Osborne, Major Dobbin and other British officers who figure in Thackeray's *Vanity Fair* in which the scene is also laid in the Napoleonic era.

And Russia's ties with the West were strengthened and enriched by the sudden late flowering of Russian culture in the nineteenth century, beginning with the poets, Pushkin and Lermontov, followed by the great prose novelists, Tolstoy, Turgenev, Dostoevsky, Gogol, to name only the most eminent. In music and, perhaps to a lesser degree, in art and science Russia before the First World War had made notable contributions to the store of European culture.

Yet Russia, although increasingly in Europe, was not altogether of Europe. The visitor to Russia from England or France, America or Germany would find many individual Russians with whom he could converse on intimate and congenial terms. Many foreigners who lived and studied in Russia in the period immediately before the First World War recall the experience as one of the pleasantest and most intellectually exciting in their lives.

But at the same time, in travel impressions and novels written about Russia by foreigners, there is almost always a sense of strangeness, of things not fully understood, of a way of life different from what was customary in the West. There is no parallel, for instance, in any Western country, for the fierce struggles that went on between the underground revolutionaries and the government police, for the extreme methods to which each side in this struggle was prepared to resort, the executions and confinements in dungeons, the banishments to Siberia, sometimes for nothing more than the expression of "dangerous

thoughts," and, on the side of the revolutionaries, many of them dedicated men and women, the resort to assassination as a means of political protest.

Perhaps the most vivid impression of strangeness is conveyed by Joseph Conrad's novel of life among Russian political exiles in Geneva, appropriately entitled *Under Western Eyes*, with its striking blend of heroism, idealism, futility, treachery and brutality.

As they became more articulate intellectually, the Russians themselves began to dispute about their historic destiny. So, in the nineteenth century, there were the opposed schools of the Westerners and the Slavophiles. The former maintained that Russia needed what the West had to offer, from more modern machinery and legal theories that would make property rights more secure to Western representative institutions.

The Slavophiles, on the other hand, contended that Russia had rather to teach the West than to learn from the West. They saw in the West grasping materialism, cold legal forms that would lead at some time to destructive revolution. They exalted the Orthodox Church, the supposed unity of the Tsar and the people and especially the traditional Russian village community, or *mir*, which seemed to them to offer a means of escaping the consequences of capitalism, the deepening gulf between the more well-to-do peasants and the landless proletariat.

This same difference carried over into the Russian revolutionary movement. The earlier *narodnik* (populist) wing of this movement gave a revolutionary coloration to some of the Slavophile conceptions. The peasant communes were to evolve into a socialist society after the Tsar, the officialdom, and the land-owners had been swept away.

The "Westerners" among the revolutionists were those who accepted, in moderate or extreme form, the theories of Karl Marx and insisted that capitalism must come to Russia, that the peasant had the instincts of the small proprietor, that the industrial working class, the "proletariat," must be the leader in the socialist reconstruction of society.

And one can see something of a clash between "Westerners" and "Easterners" in the differing doctrine, still more in the con-

trasted psychology, of the Bolsheviks, on one side, and the Mensheviks and other more moderate socialist groups, on the other. Apart from a certain doctrinaire theoretical extremism, the result of the absence in Russia of free political institutions which would have given opposition groups some training in practical experience, the Mensheviks fitted pretty well into the general pattern of European Social Democracy. In theory they were better Marxists than their opponents, because they maintained, with their master, that capitalism must exhaust its possibilities before a socialist revolution could take place.

But Lenin and his lieutenants were better practical politicians, although on fine points of doctrine they might have lost debates to the Mensheviks. Lenin was more concerned to make a social revolution under the direction of the small tightly disciplined party which he had envisaged in the days when he was an obscure political exile than he was in having the revolution take place according to the correct Marxist formula.

What came out of his experiment was abhorrent to the generally humane and civilized temper of European social democracy, and of its sympathizers in Russia. But Radek, most fiery of the early Soviet publicists, disposed of European socialists with the following propaganda phrase:

“They are no longer the right wing of the international working class movement, but the left wing of the international counter-revolution.”

It was not for nothing that Nikolai Bukharin, one of the ablest of Bolshevik theoreticians, spoke of “Genghiz Khan socialism” in referring to Stalin’s methods of forcing collective farming on the unwilling peasants by mass arrests and deportations, executions and, finally, by a gigantic state-organized famine. Nor is it without significance that the sharpest edge of Stalin’s terrors was directed against those “Old Bolsheviks” who had lived abroad, who had some knowledge of European institutions, who had some ideas and principles, however wrongheaded and perverted, besides bowing down to an absolute dictator.

Appropriately enough Stalin himself was an Asiatic, a man from the Caucasian borderland between Europe and Asia, who spoke Russian with a strong accent. The whole system which he

set up, replacing not only the Soviets, but even the ruling Communist Party, by his own unlimited personal power, supported by espionage, terror, torture, deportations and executions, bore many traits of an Oriental despotism, — an ironical accompaniment to Stalin's effort to bring Western technique to Russia.

This double commitment, to Europe and to Asia, which has often marked the course of Russian history, persists to the present day. Russia has conquered and temporarily absorbed countries with long and deep roots in the cultural soil of Europe, East Germany, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia. Khrushchev likes to play the role of the arbiter of Europe's fate, of the head of a great European power.

But strong Asiatic influences are also at work. The success of the Communist revolution in China makes Peiping an important factor in the political calculations of Moscow. And Soviet foreign policy to-day seems largely dominated by the idea of stirring up as much disturbance in colonial areas of Asia and Africa as may be possible. The supposed Russian Soviet messianic mission to hasten the triumph of Communism throughout the world has two faces, European and Asiatic. Russia is still between East and West.

Russian Marxism and Its Populist Background: The Late Nineteenth Century

By RICHARD PIPES

In the literature devoted to the emergence of Bolshevism one can find numerous allusions to its connection with the Populist tradition, and in particular with the Jacobin wing of Populism, as represented by Tkachev and by the People's Will. Perhaps the first to point out such connections were the Mensheviks who were anxious to prove Lenin's radical departure from Marxism.¹ Later, after the Bolshevik seizure of power, conservative thinkers like Peter Struve liked to point out the Populist kernel in a movement that was ostensibly Marxist.² And, more recently, historians (e.g., Michael Karpovich³), and a one-time member of the Bolshevik party now in emigration, N. Valentinov⁴ called attention to Lenin's debt to Tkachev and Chernyshevsky respectively.

Yet, despite these hints, the relationship between the two principal currents of Russian revolutionary thought has never been thoroughly examined. Probably the explanation for this lacuna in our historiography must be sought in the fact that

¹See, for instance, L. Martov's analysis of Leninism in *Istoriya ruskoi literatury XIX v.* (Moscow, 1911), edited by D. N. Ovsianiko-Kulikovsky. P. B. Akselrod, in his memoirs (*Perezhitoe i peredumanno*, Vol. I, Berlin, 1923, pp. 221-22) speaks of Bolshevism's persecution of Social-Democracy "as a particularly cruel revenge which a resuscitated Bakuninism exacted from its old opponent, a revenge for the defeats Marxism had at one time meted out [Bakunin's] 'Federal International' of blessed memory."

²Struve made this point in many of his articles, and very pointedly in his (as yet unpublished) correspondence with Kuskova in 1940.

³M. Karpovich, "A Forerunner of Lenin: P. N. Tkachev," *Review of Politics*, July, 1944.

⁴N. Valentinov, *Vstrechi s Leninyem* (New York, 1953).

Marx and some of his followers, especially those in Russia, so well succeeded in separating their movement from the common socialist heritage that even today one tends to emphasize the differences rather than similarities between Marxism and the other kinds of socialism. The purpose of this paper is to broaden somewhat the discussion of the relationship between Populism and Marxism by calling attention to the common ideological and organizational background against which Marxism in Russia had to develop.

In the West, Marxism evolved as an *ideology* in reaction to an essentially *liberal* body of opinion; that is to say, it assimilated many of the fundamental political, social, and economic doctrines of contemporary liberalism, and then proceeded to improve upon them. The liberal bourgeoisie was also its main enemy, and in the struggle against it, Marxists occasionally made common cause with the monarchy and the so-called "feudal class." (Cf. Lasalle's relations with Bismarck). Marxism as a *politically organized force*, as it emerged in Germany in the late 1860's and the 1870's, based itself on a relatively strong and class-conscious *labor movement*. By the time Marxism came in contact with it, the labor movement in Germany was already a considerable force.

In Russia, for reasons which are so obvious as to require no elaboration, the conditions in which Marxism developed were quite different. Here the principal foe of socialism was not the bourgeoisie but the *autocracy* with its vast officialdom, and the principal organizational base was not the labor movement, insignificant in a country with a rudimentary industry, but the *intelligentsia*. These two factors: the necessity of concentrating the struggle against the monarchy (at the time in its most conservative phase) instead of the bourgeoisie, and of having to wage the struggle with the help of an intelligentsia instead of a labor movement, had a profound effect on the nature and history of Russian Marxism; they help explain in large measure its peculiar relationship to Populism.

In the 1860's and 1870's — that is at the very time when the German Marxists were laying the foundations of German Social Democracy — Russian intellectuals worked out a fairly coherent

and original (in its totality if not component elements) body of revolutionary theory and practice. This theory and practice is known as "Populist," and the term is so deeply rooted in the historical vocabulary that it would be futile to try to replace it by another. Yet it suffers from a certain imprecision, an imprecision which did not escape the notice of contemporaries.⁵ The trouble with it is that it is both too broad and too narrow. If by Populism we understand a movement inspired by a "love for the people" then the term is too broad, because respect and affection for the "*narod*" and the belief in its innate moral superiority was by no means a monopoly of those known today as Populists. It is enough to recall that it characterized persons as profoundly unrevolutionary as Ivan Aksakov, Tolstoy, and Dostoevsky (for which reason Pypin lists Dostoevsky among the Populists). If, on the other hand, we define Populism in strictly political and economic terms, as a doctrine preaching, say, revolutionary agitation among the village peasants, the preservation of the *obshchina*, and the seizure of power, then it becomes too narrow because among self-styled Populists one could find men who attached no particular significance to any one of these programmatic issues. (This holds particularly true of the Populists of the later phase of the movement, in the 1880's and especially the 1890's.) Even the one seemingly distinctive doctrine of Populism, the conviction that Russia could and should skip the capitalist stage of historic development, proves on closer analysis to have been no exclusive property of the Populists: not only did many Russian conservatives share this conviction (e.g., Konstantin Leontiev), but Marx himself, as we shall see later on, considered it perfectly possible. The reason why no precise definition seems to fit what is certainly a distinct and very real historical phenomenon lies in the fact that Populism was not

⁵See, for instance, an interesting essay by A. Pypin, "Narodnichestvo," *Vestnik Evropy*, No. 1 (1884), pp. 152-82, and No. 2 (1884), pp. 702-51, in which he complains that the term is unclear and difficult to define as well as arbitrary, since it is applied to themselves and to others by people "who have very little in common with each other and may even be entirely at odds . . ." (*loc. cit.*, p. 702). Pypin identified Populism with Slavophilism and with the general rise of interest in the peasant after the emancipation of serfs, particularly as manifested in literature.

so much a concrete body of political or social doctrine as a broad spectrum of ideas and attitudes, a matrix from which emerged various specific (and often contradictory) ideologies and movements. It is as difficult to define historically as Liberalism is in the West, and for much the same reasons.

The philosophical foundations of Populism were laid down principally in the 1860's by a group of young social thinkers headed by Chernyshevsky, Dobrolubov, Lavrov, and Mikhailovsky. Their outlook rested on an uncritical acceptance of a monistic view of the universe, and on a belief in the primacy of sensory experience and its ancillary, science, over ideas and art, the superiority of society over the individual, the individual's obligation to society, and the necessity and inevitability of revolutionary upheaval of a "total" scope. For all their individual differences, the men of the "generation of the sixties" largely agreed on these general propositions; from their writings these ideas entered the mainstream of Russian revolutionary thought which, in turn, affected all of Russian secular culture in the twentieth century.

The organizational foundations of Populism, on the other hand, were laid in the subsequent decade, the 1870's, when the followers of these ideas made the first concerted effort to establish contact with the main body of Russia's working population. They were, briefly, conspiratorial circles consisting almost entirely of intellectuals (except for occasional "enlightened" peasants and workers), dedicated to agitation for a mass uprising, or to the gradual dissemination of socialist ideas, or to terror. In the course of the 1870's the Russian radicals acquired much experience in organizing revolutionary activity under the most unpropitious circumstances. This experience as well as the ideology which inspired it became an intrinsic part of Russian political practice of the left-of-center groups, and partly even liberal ones (*cf.*, for instance, the methods employed by the liberal *Osvobozhdenie* in 1902-05). Indeed, one may perhaps go further and say that Populist ideology and practice represents a new historico-cultural phenomenon of enormous importance not only for Russia but for the contemporary world in general.

As is generally known, the philosophical foundations of Pop-

ulism were constructed almost entirely of materials taken directly from the West, especially from the literature of French socialism and positivism, and German materialism. Among the foreign thinkers whose ideas were adapted by the Populists alongside Proudhon, Comte, J. S. Mill, Feuerbach, Büchner, and others, was Marx. The connection between Marx's thought and Populism occurred at the very inception of Populism; Marxism, instead of being Populism's successor, as is often thought, was in fact its contemporary and coeval.⁶ Nor was this a coincidence: for the Populists were responsible for introducing and popularizing Marx in Russia, and defending him from criticisms which were not slow in making themselves heard. The first translation of Volume I of *Das Kapital* — which, incidentally, happened to have been also the first translation of that work into any language — was begun by the Populist G. A. Lopatin, and completed by the Populist N. F. Danielson (Nikolai-on). Danielson also translated the second volume of this work. The success of these and other of Marx's writings was instantaneous, and in the 1870's Marx was more popular in Russia than in any other country, but he was popular as a *narodnik*.⁷ The initial critique of Marx came not from the Populists but from the liberals like Iu. Zhukovsky and Boris Chicherin;⁸ Populists like Mikhailovsky, on the other hand, defended Marx,⁹ so much so that Marx

⁶A. Martynov, "Glavneishye momenty v istorii russkogo marksizma," *Obshchestvennoe dvizhenie v Rossii v nachale XX veka* (St. Petersburg, 1909-14), Vol. II, Part 2, p. 286.

⁷P. B. Struve, "Karl Marks i sudby Marksizma," *Segodnya* (Riga), March 14, 1933.

⁸Iu. Zhukovsky, "Karl Marks i ego kniga o kapitale," *Vestnik Evropy*, No. 9 (1877), pp. 64-105; B. N. Chicherin, "Nemetskie sotsialisty: II. Karl Marks," *Sbornik gosudarstvennykh znanii Bezobrazova*, Vol. VI (1878).

⁹N. K. Mikhailovsky, "Po povodu russkogo izdaniya knigi K. Marks'a," *Otechestvennye zapiski*, April, 1872, and "Karl Marks pered sudom g. Iu. Zhukovskogo," *ibid.*, October, 1877, (the latter reprinted in Mikhailovsky's *Sochineniya*, Vol. IV, St. Petersburg, 1897, pp. 165-206). Later on, when the Marxist movement in Russia acquired an independent existence, Mikhailovsky's attitude toward it turned hostile.

I omit here discussion of the first true Russian Marxist, N. I. Ziber (Sieber) (1844-1888) because his contributions were largely in the field of economic theory and history, and had no connection, direct or indirect,

felt compelled to protest the Populist use of his theories. Most of the luminaries of Populism had high words of praise for Marx. Lavrov, for instance, called Marx the "great teacher," and upon Marx's death referred to him as "the most outstanding of all the socialists of our time."¹⁰ Both Danielson and V. Vorontsov (V. V.), the two leading theoreticians of a movement later known as Legal Populism, accepted some of the basic premises of Marxism—Danielson to such extent that in the 1880's he was regarded as a full-fledged Marxist.¹¹ Such examples of Marx's influence and prestige in Russia at a time when there was no Marxist or labor movement there, and Populism was the only form in which the revolutionary movement could express itself, can be multiplied. A perusal of the correspondence between Marx and Engels and the leading figures of Populism in and out of Russia reveals clearly the mutual respect and admiration.

This relationship was determined by two factors: the applicability of certain of Marx's doctrines to the general premises of Populism, and the curiously ambivalent attitude toward Populism of Marx and (to a lesser extent) Engels.

Marxism as a doctrine consists of several elements whose interconnection is as much psychological as it is logical. Marxism has a philosophical doctrine formed of an amalgam of Hegelian idealism with Feuerbachian materialism; an economic theory evolved of an adaptation and development of liberal thought; a social doctrine — perhaps the most original aspect of Marxism — which combines the teachings of French socialists and the experience of the Western labor movement with some of Marx's own insights; and, finally, of an ideal, a secularized version of an essentially religious vision, which has no direct connection with either the philosophy, or the economics, or the so-

with the revolutionary movement. Nor do I deal with the professional economists like A. I. Skvortsov, who adopted certain of Marx's technical devices of analysis such as his theories of value and of socio-economic development. These groups are discussed by P. Orlovsky [V. V. Vorosky] in his *K istorii marksizma v Rossii* (Moscow, 1919; reprint of a 1908 edition.)

¹⁰ *Perepiska K. Marksya i F. Engelsa s russkimi politicheskimi deyatelyami* ([Leningrad], 1951), 261.

¹¹ Cf. Orlovsky, *K istorii marksizma*, pp. 18-19.

ciology. This composite character of Marxism, a source of its weakness as an intellectual system and the reason why it has always served as a favorite target of critique, lends it great strength and flexibility as a political force. Marxism need not be swallowed whole, but can be taken *à la carte*, as it were; and since Marxism deliberately reconciles (or tries to reconcile) by means of the "dialectic" several incompatible elements, it is possible to isolate from it elements which, though taken by themselves are antithetical to Marxism as a whole, can be nevertheless passed off as "Marxist." (Thus, e.g., since in a feudal society capitalism is considered "progressive," the propagation of capitalism may take place under the banner of Marxism. This indeed did occur in Russia in the 1890's.)

The Populists are a case in point. They were cool towards Marx's philosophy, because it was too closely tied to Hegelian philosophy which they rejected. They also disliked much (but not all) of the sociology, because its emphasis on "inevitability" conflicted with their own belief in the "subjective method" and the role of the "critical personality," while its emphasis on the class struggle ran contrary to the cooperative tendencies imbedded in Populism. They liked the ideal; but best of all they liked the economics. Marx's labor theory of value, and its corollary, the notion of "surplus value," provided excellent ammunition in their war against capitalism. Altogether, they extracted from Marxism everything that condemned capitalism and showed its imminent, inevitable doom.

That such a use of Marx was perverse cannot be denied. Yet Marx and Engels, who could have easily set their Russian followers straight, assumed towards the Populists a highly ambivalent attitude, so much so that today it is quite impossible to determine whether in Russian matters Marx himself was a "Marxist" or a "Populist." Essentially, Marx and Engels were not much impressed with the arguments of the Populists concerning Russia's separate path to socialism. To begin with, they cordially detested Slavophilism in all its guises, partly because they had a low opinion of Slavs in general, and partly because of their unfortunate personal experiences with Bakunin. Then also, viewing as they habitually did all institutions from a com-

parative sociological vantage point, they were bound to regard the peasant commune and the *artel* as universal types characteristic of a certain specific stage of economic development rather than of any national group. Since they associated the commune and the *artel* with a pre-capitalist economy they felt quite certain that these institutions would disappear once capitalism got under way in Russia. They said so fairly explicitly on a number of occasions.¹²

But there were also good reasons why Marx and Engels failed either to come out openly against Populist doctrines or to give encouragement to Russia's nascent Marxist movement. In the 1870's when Populism was in full swing it was probably the most vigorous revolutionary movement in the world, one of the few rays of hope after the ignominious failure and dissolution of the First International. Marx and Engels greatly admired the courage of the Populists, and particularly of the terrorists.¹³ They did not wish to jeopardize the cause of the Russian revolutionary movement or their connection with it, the more so that the fall of tsarism under whatever auspices seemed to them a most effective way of weakening the cause of reaction in Europe. The incipient Marxist movement, on the other hand, seemed weak and hopeless in a country with as backward an economy as Russia. In addition, in Marx's eyes it was compromised by the fact that it emerged from the Bakuninist wing of Populism. Marx's support of the Populists came to him the easier that he thought of his theory not as a closed system but as a general method ready to face and adapt itself to the realities of the day.

¹²Cf. eg. *Perepiska Marksа i Engelsа*, pp. 153-4.

¹³Cf. Boris Nicolaevsky, "Marx und das russische Problem," *Die Gesellschaft*, Berlin), Vol. I, No. 4 (July, 1924), pp. 359-71, which cites a letter of Marx to his daughter Jenny dealing with the trial of the assassins of Alexander II: "Have you been following the judiciary proceedings in St. Petersburg against the assassins? They are thoroughly decent fellows, *sans pose mélodramatique*, simple, businesslike, heroic. Shouting and doing are two irreconcilable opposites. The Petersburg Executive Committee, which acts so energetically, puts out manifestoes of refined 'moderation' . . . They try to teach Europe that their *modus operandi* is a specifically Russian and historically inevitable manner of acting, one which lends itself as much to moralizing — for or against — as does an earthquake in Chios." (*Loc. cit.*, p. 364n; letter dated April 11, 1881).

Hence both Marx and Engels were tantalizingly vague on all the problems of vital concern to the Russian revolutionary movement. Side by side with statements which questioned the viability of the commune and *artel* they placed statements to the effect that under "certain conditions," such as an imminent revolution in the West or in Russia, either of which would cut short the further progress of Russian capitalism, that country might indeed succeed in bypassing the capitalist stage and building a socialist society directly on indigenous bases.¹⁴ In 1877, in an open letter to the editor of *Otechestvennye zapiski* written to protest the use which the Populists made of his works in support of their thesis, Marx stated that if capitalism were to keep on developing as it had since 1861 Russia would without doubt undergo full-scale capitalist development; but he immediately neutralized the effect of these words by adding that should this occur "Russia would fail to take advantage of the best opportunity ever given by history to any nation, and will have to experience all the fateful evils of the capitalist regime."¹⁵ Since the question of the "opportunity" was the very crux of the problem, there can be little wonder that the Russians were confused. Still Marx offered no help. When in 1881 Vera Zasulich implored him to settle authoritatively once and for all the debate over the commune, he again replied evasively. Citing pertinent passages from the *Capital* he showed that this work offered no evidence either for or against the survival of the commune, though he himself felt that under certain conditions (again that ambivalent clause!) the peasant commune could serve as a base for Russian socialism.¹⁶ After Marx's death, when the Russian Marxist movement got on its way in earnest, Engels deliberately stayed out of the bitter quarrels between Marxists and Populists, pleading either lack of time or inadequate knowledge of the subject. But if on

¹⁴Engels' reply to Tkachev of 1875, *Perepiska*, p. 204.

¹⁵*Perepiska*, p. 221.

¹⁶*Perepiska*, p. 301. W. Weintraub in "Marx and Russian Revolutionaries," *The Cambridge Journal*, Vol. III, No. 8 (May, 1950), p. 502 calls attention to the fact that the letter sent to Vera Zasulich was the fifth draft. Marx obviously had considerable difficulty in framing his answer. The four preceding drafts have been reproduced in *Arkhiv K. Marksа i F. Engelsа*, Vol. I (Moscow, 1924), pp. 270-86.

the matter of the commune Engels was ambivalent, on the questions of terrorism and seizure of power he backed the Populists rather than the Marxists. In 1885 he took a rather dim view of the first theoretical work of Russian Marxism, Plekhanov's *Nashi raznoglasiya* (Our disagreements), and asserted that a Populist-like revolution was both possible and desirable in Russia. Unlike the Marxist Liberation of Labor he believed that Russia was ripe for a revolution.¹⁷

The fact that Marx and Engels backed the Populists on two cardinal tenets of their doctrine — the possibility of Russia's bypassing the capitalist stage, and the feasibility of a revolutionary seizure of power — enabled their doctrine, or at least a part of it, to be incorporated into Populism. The main reason why Marxism did not at once become more influential on the level of revolutionary activity was that the revolutionaries, for whom heroic activism and personal self-sacrifice were the only true revolutionary virtues, considered Marxism, with its subtleties and faint odor of the British Museum Reading Room, a philistine way of avoiding the real issues.¹⁸ The linkup between Marxism and the revolutionary movement occurred only after 1890, following the spectacular expansion of Russian industry and urban population, at a time when the source of inspiration was not so much Marx himself as his German followers.

The penetration of Marxism as a social and political doctrine into the Russian revolutionary movement took place in the early 1880's. Marxism reached the height of its influence in Russia in the mid-1890's, and shortly afterwards, having passed its peak, experienced a succession of profound crises. In the closing two decades of the nineteenth century it showed three fairly distinct forms of expression: of those the one most intimately involved in revolutionary activity came to resemble most closely its Populist rival.

¹⁷Omitted from the *Perepiska*, this letter of Engels to Vera Zasulich of April 23, 1885 is reprinted in L. G. Deich, ed., *Gruppa "Osvobozhdenie Truda,"* No. 3 (Moscow-Leningrad, 1925), pp. 24-27.

¹⁸See, for instance, Iuzov-Kablits' statement to Axelrod in the 1870's that Marx was "a very learned man" but "not really a revolutionary." Akselrod, *Perezhitoe i peredumannoe*, Vol. I, p. 87. This was rather the prevalent view at the time.

The first of these three trends, Legal Marxism, need not detain us long, because neither its doctrines nor its practical activities were linked with the revolutionary movement. Legal Marxism, in the opinion of its founder and leading theoretician, Peter Struve, historically fulfilled the function of economic liberalism.¹⁹ The brunt of its critique was directed not against capitalism but against the system of natural economy in all its manifestations which, in its opinion, included the Populist vision of socialism. It placed great faith in the civilizing mission of capitalism in Russia, and its "conditional" approval of capitalism as a "transitory phase" was on occasion embarrassingly difficult to distinguish from genuine enthusiasm for capitalism as such. Though at the time they did consider themselves ardent and loyal Marxists, in retrospect the Legal Marxists appear rather as passionate economic and social Westernizers. Before long they moved into the liberal camp, and helped formulate the ideology of Russia's nascent Constitutional-Democratic Party.

It is the two other Marxist currents which are of interest to the present inquiry: the circle gathered around Plekhanov in Geneva, and the conspiratorial circles formed concurrently inside Russia. The nature of these two currents and their relationship is very instructive for the understanding of the Populist factor in the development of Russian Marxism.

At the beginning of this essay it was stated that one of the peculiarities of Russian socialist history was the nature of the enemy it had to face: the enemy was not the bourgeoisie, as in the West, but the autocracy. The Populists saw in this fact a great advantage for Russia because it seemed to permit a direct leap into socialism. Among other things, it implied that Russia need not go through the stage of liberal, parliamentary democracy, insofar as that political system was associated in their minds with the hegemony of capitalism. In consequence of this attitude the Populists of the 1860's and 1870's were staunchly apolitical, and sometimes even anti-political: they believed in a thoroughgoing social and moral transformation, and refused to participate in the struggle for political liberties and rights on the grounds that the benefit of such liberties and rights would ac-

¹⁹Karl Marks i sudby Marksizma," *Segodnya*, loc. cit.

crue entirely to the exploiting classes, and help tighten their grip on the rest of society.²⁰ Instead of participating in the fight for political liberalization which gathered momentum after 1861, the Populists concentrated on the more or less immediate abolition of state power. This strategy came to be questioned in the late 1870's as a result of the revolutionary disappointment with the peasantry and the dismal failure of all efforts at a violent overthrow of the government. The People's Will organization represented a significant phase in the development of Populism by its recognition of the importance of politics and the political struggle. In particular A. I. Zheliabov, a revolutionary well-known for his part in the assassination of Alexander II but rather neglected as an original political thinker, first linked the Populist movement with the broad nationwide struggle for political rights. Henceforth all Populism was in some measure imbued with a political spirit. But by and large on the level of action Populist "politics" tended toward terrorism. The real assertion of the political factor, the rechanneling of revolutionary activity from *buntarstvo* and violent seizure of power to deliberate manipulation of forces on the political battlefield was the outstanding contribution of that offshoot of Populism which, under Plekhanov's leadership, went over to Marxism.

Plekhanov's program involved a two-stage transition to socialism. First of all, the socialists would cooperate with all the other classes and groups of society in a united front against the autocracy for the purpose of winning general political and civil liberties; at the same time they would organize a large and powerful labor party. In the second stage, after Russia had been transformed into a Western-style democracy, the socialists would use the labor party to wrest power from the possessing classes

²⁰The program of *Vpered* in 1873-76, the most important organ of the Populist revolutionaries, had this to say of political problems: "We oppose all present-day centralized political problems. All political parties with their more or less liberal constitutional ideals, all attempts to replace the centralized and bourgeois empire with a centralized and bourgeois republic, to replace the existing division of [Russia's] territory with another having other centers and other laws — all this we consider inimical in its basic structure and indifferent in its manifestations." V. Burtsev, ed., *Za sto let (1800-1896)*, I (London, 1897), p. 109.

and to establish socialism. Such a strategy implied among other things the abandonment of the traditional Populist dichotomy between the "exploiters" and the "exploited" in favor of a subtler distinction within the "exploiter" class, conflicts and contradictions within which the "exploited" would use to their advantage. Of course, once the Marxist movement emancipated itself organizationally from its Populist matrix, the area of disagreement between it and Populism widened all the time. But the demand for regular socialist participation in the struggle for political liberties in Russia as part of the overall long-range strategy was in point of chronology the first and in point of importance the most outstanding departure of Marxism from classical Populism.

The second significant contribution of Marxism to revolutionary ideology was to shift the center of attention from the rural peasant to the urban worker. This shift, though emphatically acknowledged and propagated by Plekhanov's *Liberation of Labor*, did not materially affect the activities of this group because it functioned throughout its existence abroad without directly participating in the revolutionary movement. It greatly affected, however, the revolutionary Marxist circles inside Russia, and it is in these circles from which later sprang the Bolshevik movement that the connection with the Populist tradition is particularly striking.

It is probably fair to say that the Populist movement, despite its close identification with the peasantry, was not inherently committed to it. Populism's commitment was to the *narod*, the working people, and because in Russia of the 1860's and 1870's the *narod* consisted almost entirely of peasants, the Populists were peasant-oriented. But there was nothing in Populist premises or attitudes that precluded an alliance with the industrial proletariat, the more so since in the early phases of industrialization the proletariat consisted anyway of peasants, many of whom still retained their ties to the village commune.²¹ Indeed, in the heyday of Populism two worker organizations were ac-

²¹Some of the confusion in the Populist attitude toward the peasant and the industrial worker stems from the fact that in the early Populist movement the terms *rabochii*, (worker) *rabochii narod* (working people) and *narod* (people) were often used indiscriminately and interchangeably.

tually formed. One was Evgenii Zaslavsky's *Iuzhno-rossiiskii soiuz rabochykh* (Southern Russian Union of Workers), the other S. V. Khalturin's and V. Obnorsky's *Severnyi soiuz russkih rabochikh* (Northern Union of Russian Workers) (Odessa, 1872-75, and St. Petersburg, 1878-81, respectively). Both these organizations drew their membership from industrial workers without thereby losing their Populist character and standing. The Bakuninists were quite active among the industrial workers, and in 1875-76 even published a special paper, *Rabotnik*, for distribution among them. The People's Will in all its principal programmatic statements paid particular attention to the industrial proletariat. Its program of 1879 had a special section devoted to that class, which opened with a statement that the "urban working population has an especially important relationship to the revolution" since the success of the first revolutionary strike depended entirely on their and the army's attitude.²² In the early 1890's, with famine which forced many peasants to move into the cities, and the simultaneous spurt of Russia's industrial development, the urban proletariat grew so rapidly (from 1.4 million to 2.4 million in a single decade, 1890-1899) that all the revolutionary parties in some measure shifted their attention to it. To illustrate this fact one need only recall that the program of the Saratov Union of Socialist Revolutionaries formed in 1897-1898, which later evolved into the program of the Socialist Revolutionary Party, described the industrial proletariat as the "vanguard of the working class," and stated that the peasants could be expected to make themselves felt as a revolutionary force only in the future.²³

Of itself, therefore, the shift to revolutionary work among industrial workers did not represent a departure from Populism. What then did? The question is difficult to answer. True, the men calling themselves "Marxists" and those calling themselves "Populists" argued interminably whether or not capitalism would come to Russia. But these debates had little if any impact

²²Burtsev, *Za sto let*, I. pp. 159-60. Other programmatic statements of a similar nature can be found *ibid.*, pp. 168-72.

²³M. Balabanov, *Ocherk istorii revoliutsionnogo dvizheniya v Rossii* (Leningrad, 1929), p. 177.

on practical revolutionary activity. The same holds true of the other areas of disagreement as outlined by such historians as Martov and Balabanov.²⁴ The revolutionaries inside Russia acted with striking similarity of means and methods, inspired in part by a common body of traditions inherited from the generation of the 1860's and 1870's, and in part by similar conditions of work. The only significant exception to this rule was the attitude toward terrorism. The general impression one gains is that in the 1880's and 1890's inside Russia the Populist circles were deeply affected by Marxism, while Marxist circles were heavily under Populist influence, with Populism exerting its influence on the organizational level, and Marxism on the theoretical one. And that was because the Populists had worked out in the preceding thirty years an organizational and agitational technique particularly suitable to a country with a large professional revolutionary cadre, an unorganized and unenlightened working population, and an efficient police force. Theoretically, however, Populism could not compete with the more modern and scientific doctrines coming from the West, the more so since Marxism could point to spectacular successes in Europe and seemed to answer more closely the needs of a rapidly industrializing Russia.

If we define Russian Marxism as a doctrine advocating, as its immediate program, collaboration with the bourgeoisie and liberal gentry in a common struggle for political liberties, with a simultaneous organization of a large labor movement, then we must conclude that the actual practice of the Marxist circles operating within Russia often was not "Marxist." The difficulty lay in practical application of these directives. Work among the industrial proletariat was possible only on the basis of some sort of economic agitation which had to be directed against the bourgeoisie and could not be easily transformed into a struggle for political liberties in collaboration with the very same bourgeoisie. On the other hand under conditions prevailing in Russia, the organization of the working class entailed conspiracy. Thus, in fact, whatever their theoretical commitments, in practice the Marxist revolutionaries operating in Russia had to revert to

²⁴L. Martov, ed., *Istoriya russkoi sotsial-demokratsii* ([Petrograd], 1918) pp. 10-14; Balabanov, *loc. cit.*

economic agitation and secret, intelligentsia-led circles, that is to forms of revolutionary activity devised and perpetuated by Populists.

This tendency of revolutionary Marxism was not fully evident at the time of its inception. The programmatic statements of the first two Marxist organizations inside Russia, the so-called groups of Blagoev (1884-85) and Brusnev (1889-91) employed, in addition to Populist slogans and language, also political appeals which linked the interests of the working population with those of political liberty in Russia. But the Marxist circles which multiplied throughout the country in the 1890's seemed to have pushed these political issues into the background. One gains the impression that the principal appeal of Marxism for the members of these early circles lay not so much in its specific doctrines as in its overall qualities of novelty and "scientism." It was a newer, more up-to-date revolutionary doctrine which by its mere novelty attracted some among those who were disappointed by the failures of Populism, and were willing to try a "German" approach. Its "scientific" aura was especially appealing; it is significant that Marxism in its early phase enjoyed its greatest popularity among students of technological institutes.

Until 1894-1895 the Marxist revolutionaries inside Russia confined their activity to the formation of circles (*kruzhki*) patterned directly after Populist ones. They devoted themselves to study, discussion, and the inculcation of class-consciousness in a small, select group of workers. But in 1895 the character of their activity changed. The immediate cause of the change was the appearance of a brief and today largely forgotten essay of considerable historic importance called *Ob agitatsii* (On Agitation), written by two theoreticians of the Jewish socialist movement, A. Kremer and Iulii Martov. Drawing on the experience of the Jewish Marxist groups which had conducted successfully in and around Vilna a series of industrial strikes (1892-93), the authors of this essay argued that the time had come for Russian Marxists to shift from study and propaganda circles to active agitation among industrial workers. This agitation was to be based on the worker's daily needs and lead, from specific grievances to mass strikes, and from mass strikes to the organization

of a countrywide labor movement.²⁵ The essay spread first in St. Petersburg and then in other parts of the empire. In a short time under its impact Russian Marxists took to agitation in factories, instigating industrial disturbances and work stoppages, and organizing factory workers — activity which culminated in the great strike of St. Petersburg textile workers in May, 1896, the first large-scale industrial strike in Russian history. Perhaps the outstanding Marxist group of the "new" type was the one active in St. Petersburg under the leadership of Martov and Lenin under the name *Soiuz borby za osvobozhdenie rabochego klassa* (The Union of Struggle for the Liberation of the Working Class). This group served as a model for many similar organizations based on the Kremer-Martov program which sprang up in various parts of the Russian Empire in 1896 and 1897. The association of these *Soiuzy* with the Jewish *Bund* led to the First Congress of Marxists in Minsk in 1898 and the founding of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party.

The Plekhanov circle in Geneva seems first to have established contact with the *Soiuz borby* in the spring of 1895 when E. I. Sponti and Lenin arrived in Switzerland as representatives of Russian Marxist circles. The Genevan émigrés were understandably excited by evidence of an emergent Marxist movement in the homeland and they were impressed by the vigor and intelligence of its representatives. But their enthusiasm was somewhat tempered by some strange and disturbing attitudes of the visitors. Sponti, who was the first to arrive, criticized the Liberation of Labor publications for their "theoretical" tone, dismissed Marx and Bebel as "non-proletarian" writers, and urged the Genevans to write agitational material accessible to the average worker. Axelrod already at the time considered him a "Social-Democratic Populist." With Lenin there were disagreements over socialist attitudes toward liberals. Both Plekhanov and Axelrod tried to persuade him to "turn his face instead of his back" to the liberals. Lenin listened politely but did not seem

²⁵*Ob agitatsii* (Geneva, 1896). The Kremer-Martov pamphlet first circulated in manuscript form. It was published by the Liberation of Labor group with a foreword and commentary by Axelrod.

convinced.²⁶ These first misunderstandings presaged the quarrels and cleavage that were to come in the next decade.

Lenin brought with him a manuscript copy of *Ob agitatsii*. This essay caused considerable dismay in Geneva. It was decided to publish it but with a long commentary by Axelrod which would point out its fallacies and implicit dangers. In effect, Axelrod wrote, the program outlined by the authors was no more or less than a reversion to the old Bakuninist program which the Marxists had long since left behind. To prove his point he quoted from an editorial from *Zemlia i Volia* of 1879 which indeed did resemble very closely the main argument of *Ob agitatsii*.²⁷ The neo-Bakunists, like their predecessors, erred, in Axelrod's opinion, in ignoring the historical tendencies implicit in the bourgeois order and conceiving the struggle for socialism in the simple terms of "exploited" and "exploiters." The failure of Kremmer and Martov to indicate the need for allies among the other anti-autocratic groups, *i.e.* the failure to think in Marxist political terms, indicated to him a rejection of the principles on which Russian Marxism had always rested. With this estimate Plekhanov fully concurred.²⁸

²⁶Axelrod's notes on his encounters with Sponti and Lenin can be found in P. A. Berlin, V. S. Voitinsky and B. I. Nikolaevsky, eds., *Perepiska G. V. Plekhanova i P. B. Akselroda*, Vol. I (Moscow, 1925), pp. 265-75.

²⁷This editorial called for intensified revolutionary activity among the industrial workers. "Our urban workers are not, like those of the West, cut off from the land, but like them they are the most volatile, most explosive, most revolutionary part of the population." It went on to say that a social revolution would succeed only if the industrial workers supported the peasants, and to win the workers for the cause of revolution it urged agitation in the factories centered on the workers' immediate economic needs. "Such agitation can be conducted daily and hourly on the basis of the most insignificant facts of the worker's life . . ." Before long, the worker would identify his enemy, and come to understand that his private problems could be solved only within a national framework, in consequence of a radical change of the whole regime. The editorial also laid great stress on the need for solidarity and conspiracy among the organizers of the worker movement. *Zemlia i Volia*, No. 4 (February 20, 1879), reprinted in B. Basilevsky-Iakovlev, *Revoliustionnaya zhurnalistika semidesyatkh godov* (Paris, 1905), pp. 323-37.

²⁸See Plekhanov's letter to Axelrod of July 1896 in *Perepiska Plekhanova i Akselroda*, I, 137. Plekhanov publicly took *Ob agitatsii* to task later, in 1901, in an article called "Eshche raz sotsializm i politicheskaya borba" (Once more socialism and the political struggle), *Zarya*, No. 1 (April,

How close programmatically and organizationally were the Marxist and Populist revolutionary groups operating in Russia in the early 1890's is indicated by the relations between the St. Petersburg *Soiuz borby* with the local *Gruppa narodovoltsev* (People's Will Group). The latter was formed in the spring of 1895 for the purpose of conducting agitation among industrial workers. Its main organ was the *Letuchii listok* (Flying Leaf), printed on the group's own printing press, of which four issues came out before the press was discovered and its owners arrested.²⁹ It was a typical Populist organization in the sense that it was conspiratorial, consisted mostly of intellectuals with a selected membership of "progressive" workers, and concentrated on agitation on the basis of immediate economic needs. Its Populist allegiance was not affected by sympathy to Marxism and receptivity to Marxist theories; the latter came mainly from Lavrov who by that time, as is known, gravitated to a semi-Marxist position. During the sixteen months of its existence, the *Gruppa narodovoltsev* maintained very intimate relations with the *Soiuz borby*. Lenin in particular kept in close touch with it through Lidia Knipovich.³⁰ The group published at least two of Lenin's early pamphlets *Zakon o shtrafakh* and *O stachkakh*, exchanged speakers with its Marxist counterpart, and cooperated with it in revolutionary work. With time the relations became so intimate that there was talk of a merger, a plan that was foiled by police arrests. The generally well-informed police were so confused by the similarity of theory and practice of the two revolutionary groups that it considered the *Soiuz borby* to have been a direct descendant of Populist organizations and of "identical convictions."³¹ A study of the pamphlets and es-

1901), reprinted in G. V. Plekhanov, *Sochineniya*, Vol. XII (Moscow, [1925]), pp. 67-102.

²⁹All four numbers are fully reproduced in P. Kudelli's *Narodovoltsy na pereputii* (Leningrad, 1926). Kudelli herself was a member of this group who later went over to the Bolsheviks.

³⁰On her, see V. I. Lenin, *Sochineniya*, 2nd ed., Vol. VI (Moscow, 1935), p. 463.

³¹See confidential contemporary police reports in *Ministerstvo vnutennikh del, Obzor vazhneishikh doznanii proizvodivshikhsia v zhandarnskikh upravleniyakh Imperii po gosudarstvennym prestupleniyam*, vol. XIX-XX (1895-1896), (n. p., n. d.), pp. 107-8.

pecially the agitational material put out by the St. Petersburg *Soiuz borby* indicates that it largely ignored the political program which constituted perhaps the main plank in the Russian Marxist platform.³²

It is from this background, Populist in its attitude and technique, that there emerged the revolutionary Marxist movement in Russia, and, as an offshoot from it, Bolshevism. The rise of Bolshevism itself is outside the scope of this paper, but a few words about it may not be out of place.

The two-phase revolutionary program which Plekhanov devised for Russia was subtle and clever, but it would not work. The alliance with the liberals, as the abortive negotiations over the *Iskra* (the so-called Pskov meetings of 1900) showed, led to no practical result, and before long the two movements split, the liberals and some socialist splinter groups going their separate ways. On the other hand, agitation among workers did not progress from economic to political activity at all; it founded on "economism," and showed a natural inclination not to socialism but to trade unionism. Thus, neither the bourgeoisie nor the workers were prepared to dance the tune the Marxists played;

³²S. N. Valk and I. Tovstukha, *Listovki petersburskogo "Soiuza borby za osvobozhdenie rabochego klassa,"* VRTE-VRTG, (Moscow, 1934). In a book published in 1905, Vladimir Akimov (Makhnovets), defending the so-called "economist" tendency reminded his opponents that in the 1890's all the Marxist groups in Russia, Lenin's included, engaged in "economist" practices (i.e., avoidance of alliance with other classes in the struggle for political liberty, and over-emphasis on day to day material needs of the working class). According to Akimov, "not a single proclamation of the [St. Petersburg] *Soiuz borby* revealed any political tendency," though this may be an exaggeration. V. Akimov, *Materyaly dlya kharakteristiki razvitiya rossiiskoi sotsialdemokraticeskoi rabochei partii* (Geneva, 1904-1905), p. 41.

each class preferred to work for its own immediate interests, using the help proffered them by the Marxists, but unwilling to be used in turn. In the end, the Marxists who expected to be the manipulators, found themselves to be the objects of manipulation.

It was the realization of this fact that caused Lenin's profound crisis in 1901-1902, a crisis that led to *Chto delat* and the formulation of the Bolshevik program. Instead of collaboration with

the bourgeoisie and reliance on the proletariat, each of whom had proved treacherous, Lenin reverted to the tight, secret, professional revolutionary organization.³³ This organization was to substitute conspiracy for a broad alliance with liberals as well as a broadly based, democratic labor movement. By so doing, Lenin abandoned the two principal tenets of Russian Marxism, and reverted to the older Populist practices.³⁴

The reason for Lenin's dramatic deviation from Russian Marxism, and to some extent for his ultimate triumph, lies not so much in his personal affinity for Populism, but in the fact that Marxism, in the Plekhanovite version at any rate, was inapplicable to Russia. Populism, on the other hand, with its emphasis on the seizure of power by revolutionaries, the need for a tight, professional organization, and a mass peasant uprising to back the cities, rested on a sound analysis of the revolutionary situation.

That Russian Marxism, for all its initial successes, would eventually have to follow the path marked by the Populists, was probably first foreseen by the theoreticians of the so-called *Gruppa starykh norodovoltsev* (Veterans of the People's Will) formed in Paris and Switzerland in 1893. In polemical articles directed against the Marxists, they quickly cut through all the arguments about the fate of capitalism, the peasant commune, and alliance with the liberals, to the substance of the revolutionary problem: how to organize and carry out a revolution. And as experienced hands at this business, the old *narodovoltsy* found the Plekhanovite plan of action unrealistic. One E. G. Levit,

³³Lenin's organizational ideas seem to have had their immediate antecedents in the views of the so-called "centralist" faction of the St. Petersburg *Soiuz borby* led by S. I. Radchenko. A member of the *Soiuz borby* in 1895-96, V. N. Katin-Iartsev, wrote in his recollections published in 1907, that Radchenko and his followers were "centralists-conspirators who nevertheless considered themselves guardians of Marxist traditions. They had a high opinion of conspiracy, and were addicted to centralism largely from conspiratorial considerations for which reason they opposed the democratization of the center, and refused to accept workers into it." Their opponents favored a broad, democratic organization. [V. N.] Katin] Ia [rtsev], "Pervye shagi," *Byloe*, September, 1907, p. 149.

³⁴I do not touch on his abandonment of the central tenet of Russian Marxism, the belief in the inevitability of capitalism in Russia, because this subject exceeds the chronological limitations of this paper.

writing in this group's principal publication appearing in Geneva in 1897, thus stated the lines along which all revolutionary activity in Russia would have to develop in the future:

1. The new party will direct its main effort against absolutism.
2. The new party will constitute a new compact organization, because the enemy is too strong to be fought by individuals or groups operating in isolation.
3. Since there is among us not a *single* politically mature class of population, the party will recruit its members in all the classes of society (at first, mainly from among the young intelligentsia).
4. Since our revolutionary forces are not numerous, the party will have to have (as long as there is absolutism) *a strictly conspiratorial character.*³⁵

Lavrov, who was connected with this group, made similar points, and concluded that should these prognostications prove correct, "then *in fact* the Russian Social-Democratic movement will have adopted the program of its opponent, the People's Will, no matter what it should choose to call itself."³⁶

³⁵Staryi narodovolets, "Otkrytoe pismo k narodvoltsam-izdateliam *Letuchego listka*," in *Materyaly dlya russkogo sotsialno-revoliutsionnogo dvizheniya*, Nos. 6 & 7 (Geneva, 1897). Plekhanov's sarcastic and not very convincing defence can be found in his "Gg. Lavrov i staryi narodovolets o programmnykh voprosakh," Plekhanov, *Sochineniya*, Vol. IX (Moscow-Petrograd, 192[4]), pp. 322-31.

³⁶P. Lavrov, "O programmnykh voprosakh," *Letuchii listok Gruppy narodovoltsev*, No. 4 (December 9, 1895), reprinted in Kudelli, *Narodovoltsy*, pp. 155-59, as well as V. I. Lenin, *Sobranie Sochinenii*, 1st edition, Vol. I (Moscow, 1924), pp. 501-06. Lenin's rather muddled comments on Lavrov's striking essay can be found in his *Zadachi russkikh sotsial-demokratov* (Geneva, 1898), reprinted in his *Sochineniya*, 2nd edition, Vol. II (Moscow-Leningrad, 1927), pp. 180-84.

The Literary Importance of Khlebnikov's Longer Poems

By VLADIMIR MARKOV

I

RUSSIAN FUTURISM, as ordinarily understood, was a sort of poetic radicalism, a movement led by aggressive and vociferous men, which briefly scandalized Russia, soon reached its end and gave birth to a great number of literary groups of lesser importance and ephemeral existence. Its study has always been sporadic, and now, half a century after its appearance, there is still no work on it which might claim to be definitive. All this is largely owing to the fact that it has been under a semi-ban in Russia for almost thirty years; nor could the study be carried on in exile because the elite of Russian émigré literature rejected Futurism for reasons of its own.

There is hardly any important issue connected with Russian Futurism that has been definitely settled. There is no agreement as to when it began and ended; there are many reasons to doubt that its two original groups — “The Ego” — and “The Cubo-Futurists” — had anything in common. One might also question the right of practically any of the Futurists — with the exception of A. Kruchonykh — to be called a Futurist; on the other hand, if one agrees on a wider interpretation of the movement, some Russian Symbolists, Acmeists and other poets begin to look like Futurists. Thus it becomes less and less clear what Futurism was about and what were its sources. One striking example of its inner complexity is, for instance, the existence of ties with Western European culture but, at the same time, the general anti-Western orientation of its leading figures. Finally, the very term “Futurism” is a misnomer in more than one respect.

Velimir Khlebnikov, (1885-1922), whose first name is usually misspelled as Velemir, is not an exception in this context. He is

still an enigmatic and elusive poet, worshipped by a few, dismissed as a crank by some, and ignored by the majority. There is a reason to believe, though, that now in Russia Khlebnikov is valued more than one could judge by what is said in published form. The forthcoming edition of his works, after a break of twenty years, is one proof of this. Khlebnikov's true stature is seldom realized by poets and critics, and his influence and importance in Russian poetry are too often passed over even by responsible scholars. Is it an accident that recently a Slavist of world reputation made three errors in a single one-line bibliographical entry referring to the main edition of Khlebnikov's works? Obviously, an introduction to Khlebnikov is badly needed, and no existing edition of his works can serve as such introduction. No anthology (including the one compiled by me in 1952) offers a good selection of his poetry. Such a highly desirable introductory edition, which would have to include more of his letters and be provided with better commentaries than was the case before, is hardly probable in Russia and is impossible of realization outside of that country.

A separate edition of all Khlebnikov's longer poems (*poemy*) could be a fine introduction to his work. They form a world of their own within his work, and they are more revealing and representative of his true poetic nature than either his ambitious "supertales" (*sverkhpovesti*), to which he attached so much importance, or the numerous experimental sketches which were extolled beyond their real importance by his admirers. There is much more unity, spontaneity and organic development in these poems than in any other literary category attempted by Khlebnikov. In them he displays his true originality, supreme artistry and infinite variety. In short, it is in his *poemy* that Khlebnikov shows what he really is: a major Russian poet and a giant of twentieth-century poetry.

II

Three of Khlebnikov's "little tragedies," the ballads "Maria Vetsera" (*Mariya Vechora*), "Juno's Lover" (*Lyubovnik Yunony*) and "Alchak" already contain many features which are characteristic of his longer poems. These seem to be early works,

probably written around 1908, and they prepare for and anticipate his *poemy* in many respects.

Possibly the earliest genuine *poema* by Khlebnikov is his "The Tsar's Bride" (*Tsarskaya nevesta*), presumably written in 1908, which forms a curious finale to the popular tradition of romantic poems portraying Ivan the Terrible and his time. At the beginning of this tradition stands Lermontov's "Song of the Merchant Kalashnikov" (1837), and the period of its greatest popularity is linked with the name of Alexey K. Tolstoy. Despite the associations with L. Mey evoked by the title, Khlebnikov's work is based on a different source, "The Tsarina Maria Dolgoruky" by A. A. Navrotsky (1839-1905), a forgotten third-rate poet of the seventies (a fact never noted by Khlebnikov scholars). Its five episodes remind one of five acts in some Russian opera, presented, however, as though seen through the eyes of a child. In this poem Khlebnikov already appears as a mature artist with an original technique. The melodramatic story is charmingly touched with infantilism, and the scene where the heroine is drowned is full of strange beauty.

"Malusha's Granddaughter" (*Vnuchka Malushi*), written in 1909, marks a shift by Khlebnikov to more ancient times and away from the centers of Russian empire, Moscow and Petersburg. This trend towards decentralization meant much to him. Partly based on the Primary Russian Chronicle and filled with pagan Slavic mythology, which will play an important part in Khlebnikov's later *poemy*, this work is placed in the time of Prince Vladimir and in some respects resembles Pushkin's "Russlan and Ludmilla." Though obviously a part of the contemporary symbolist infatuation with Russian paganism (see works by A. Remizov, S. Gorodetsky and K. Balmont in 1907-08), "Malusha's Granddaughter" belongs to the older and greater tradition of the "Russian" poem of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, which includes the names of Radishchev, Vostokov, Zhukovsky, Batyushkov, Pushkin (see his plan of "Mstislav") and Katenin. The poem shows the poet's first-hand familiarity with the Old Russian language. The second part of the poem rather surrealistically brings the heroine to the

Petersburg of the twentieth century, and it ends with a bitter satire on contemporary university education.

"Malusha's Granddaughter" marks the beginning of the period in Khlebnikov's life and work which may be called the Petersburg period. It extends from 1908, when he enrolled in the University of Petersburg, to 1916, when he was drafted. Although, biographically, Khlebnikov visited many places and traveled continuously during that time, he kept returning to Petersburg's literary life. In a few *poemy*, the city appears directly ("Malusha's Granddaughter," "The Crane") or indirectly ("The End of Atlantis").

Another *poema* of 1909, "The Crane" (*Zhuravl*) is a surrealistic Petersburg fantasy, worthy of a place in the Pushkin-Gogol-Dostoevsky-Bely tradition. Though it pays tribute to Symbolism in its Brysov-like atmosphere of apocalyptic urbanism, its main theme, the revolt of inanimate objects, anticipates Mayakovsky whose "Vladimir Mayakovsky" (1913), "Mystery-Bouffe" (1918) and "150,000,000" (1919-1920) are direct offshoots of "The Crane," both thematically and rhythmically. A similar eschatological mood permeates "The Serpent Trains" (*Zmei poezda*), written in 1910, with its vision of a monstrous dragon devouring the passengers on a train who are hardly aware of the danger. This interesting example of Khlebnikov's didactic Symbolism with its "return to nature" message is always overlooked by critics and scholars. It is reminiscent of Alexey K. Tolstoy's "The Dragon" and of Dante's *Commedia*.

Also in 1910, Khlebnikov wrote a *poema* which constitutes an exception among the rest because it is based on neologisms. His preoccupation with the coining of new words is well-known, but it is rather surprising to find only one long poem reflecting this tendency. This poem was entitled, presumably not by the author, "The War, the Death" (*Vojna-smert*), and it is again exceptional among Khlebnikov's epics because of its essentially lyrical character. In fact, it is reminiscent of the grandeur of the eighteenth-century ode, and its partly obscure message consists of dark prophesies. The title is a misnomer since many images have revolutionary rather than martial connotations. The poem shows Khlebnikov's profound disillusionment and his regrets

about his country's being split into two irreconcilable political camps.

In 1911 begins what can be termed the flowering of primitivism in Khlebnikov's work. Prehistoric background attracts him now, and in "The Forest Maiden" (*Lesnaya deva*) we find a kind of Russian Stone Age with naked lovers surrounded by primeval forests. The protagonists are part of nature: they even lack names. The poem begins with a passionate tryst, but ends in a duel of two rivals and the death of one of them. Nevertheless, this does not deprive the poem of a unique lightness and charm. Its nearest equivalent in the arts would be the paintings of Henri Rousseau.

The Stone Age of "I and E" (*I i E*) is less abstract, and Khlebnikov even adds some mythological and anthropological details in his attempts to portray prehistoric society, its religion and priesthood, its hunting and fishing ways. There is a rare poetic enchantment in this story of two lovers who seek death but find happiness and glory. From several points of view this poem may be considered one of Khlebnikov's early masterpieces. Its metrical balance, the subtlety with which the poet puts together the episodes, the diversity of his primitivistic technique, and unusual freshness and lightness make it one of his best achievements.

The first of Khlebnikov's *poem* to appear in a separate edition was written by him in collaboration with Alexey Kruchonykh in 1912. This grotesque picture of a card game in hell, played by devils and sinners, is entitled "A Game in Hell" (*Igra v adu*) and has its source in Pushkin's "Sketches to the *Faust*-work" (1825).

A return to tragedy, while still retaining the primitivistic flavor, can be observed in another *poema* of 1912, "The End of Atlantis" (*Gibel Atlantidy*). The two protagonists in this work, a priest and a slave girl, personify rationalism and instinct. After the priest, provoked by the girl, kills her, revenge begins, and the poem ends in the eschatological spectacle of a flood. There is something of the somber beauty of Pushkin's "Bronze Horseman" in this poem's tragically fantastic atmosphere, in the predominance of classical outline, and, finally, in the description

of the flood. Its verse is more stabilized and its composition shows a simplicity and finish rare in Khlebnikov's poetry.

After the *Atlantis* poem, peace and idyllic life are restored in Khlebnikov's *poemy*, and this can be found in purest form in "A Villa and a Wood-Goblin" (*Vila i leshy*). There is very little action in this Russian version of "L'Après-midi d'un faune," and the greater part of the poem consists of the mischievous coquettish Slavic nymph's rondo-like teasing of a lazy, old wood-goblin. This is interspersed with a description of a hot day. In contradistinction to the preceding poem, it looks like a draft lazily sketched on a hot day similar to the one described in the poem.

The next idyll, written also in 1912 and entitled "A Witch-Doctor and Venus" (*Shaman i Venera*) has much in common with the preceding *poema*. Here Venus, tired of the West, appears in the cave of an old, impassive Siberian witch-doctor, who remains unmoved by her feminine subtlety. This is a twentieth-century mock-heroic poem with stress on absurd contrast, nonsense and irrelevance. The poem is full of logical contradictions, grotesque exaggeration, tautological constructions and literary parody.

The ties of Russian Futurism with the eighteenth century have been noted by several scholars, but there have never been any studies of this relationship. In earlier poems one could observe Khlebnikov within such eighteenth-century traditions as the mock-heroic poem, "the Russian" poem, and the high ode. In "Khadzhi-Tarkhan" (1913), Khlebnikov's tribute to his native city of Astrakhan, he resurfaces another genre largely neglected during the nineteenth century: the descriptive poem. It is a succession of landscapes, historical episodes and meditations on history, which follow each other in seemingly haphazard fashion. It is also a poem of vast spaces and great distances, occasionally extending Russia to the borders of India, ancient Egypt, and Assyria. These great vistas, in combination with a kind of golden languor which covers all like patina, make the poem an inimitable work deserving the name of masterpiece. Its verse moves like the Volga it describes, which begins and ends the poem and is felt throughout the entire poem. Also masterful are his use of

epithets, condensation of meaning in a single line, variety of color and the force and precision of some of his images.

There is more tired blood in "Rustic Friendship" (*Selskaya druzhba*), probably written in 1913. This is a romantic poem whose plot is based on mystery and whose locale is in the Western part of Russia. It imitates, in fact it almost parodies, the Russian Byronic poems of the 1820's and the 1830's, although hand in hand with this there are distinct elements of icon-painting which hardly blend with complexly constructed similes and other tropes and elaborate rhyming patterns.

The shorter "Rural Enchantment" (*Selskaya ocharovannost*), while still an idyll, marks a turn towards realism both in the portrayal of protagonists and in a wealth of detail of everyday life, which sometimes makes the poem resemble a Dutch painting. For the first time, a Khlebnikov *poema* is not a romantic reproduction of history or a mythological fantasy but a slice of contemporary life, devoid, however, of any social element. It builds an excellent bridge from Khlebnikov's early "passéism" to his attempts "to face reality" after the Revolution of 1917.

The first six *poemy* written after the Revolution belong to what may be called the Kharkov period in Khlebnikov's life (1919-20). They are tied to each other not only thematically or stylistically but also geographically. In many respects Khlebnikov continues to write in Kharkov in his old idiom, but attempts to abandon or to modify the old habits are also discernible. He turns more and more to the nineteenth-century tradition in his rhyme, verse melody, imagery and sound. Lyricism and meditation take the place of illogical primitivism and persiflage. Now he posits problems and tries to solve them on other than an esthetic level. Contemporary events now appear directly in Khlebnikov's works, but all these new elements appear more or less shyly and the old manner still prevails.

"A Night in a Trench" (*Noch v okope*), written in 1919, is a typical work of Khlebnikov's intermediate period. One finds in it remnants of the early periods, a growing conservatism, some important new elements, and starting points for the development of subsequent Soviet poetry. The theme is the Revolution and the Civil War of 1917-20, but historical details do not con-

tradict a certain timelessness added to the whole by the fact that the ancient Scythian stone statues watch the battle between the Reds and the Whites. The epic, non-realist cavalry attack is reminiscent in spirit, if not in content, of the *Igor-Tale*. Although the poet's Communist sympathies here are unmistakable, Khlebnikov's presentation is a far cry from the familiar clichés of Soviet poetry about the Civil War. This difference becomes even more clear with Khlebnikov's portrayal of Lenin, multi-dimensional, unorthodox and very much superior to that of Mayakovsky, not to mention the pathetic endeavors of lesser poets.

"A Stone Woman" (*Kamennaya baba*) is a little sister of the preceding *poema*; a lyrical variation on the same theme unjustly neglected even by Khlebnikov's admirers. It is the same battlefield with ancient statues, except that there is no battle, and a poet, "the last painter of the unheard-of terror on earth," bewails the death of thousands in the Civil War, as Khlebnikov did in the earlier "The War, the Death." The second part of the poem, however, is a magnificent dance, a "blue hopak," which reaches universal proportions, sparkling with richness of color, meter and rhyme.

The most important *poema* of the period is, in my opinion, "The Poet" (*Poet*). Here Khlebnikov deepens his favorite genre of idyll and achieves a synthesis of the primitivism of his early work with the classical elements which now come to the fore. The splendid introductory lines, mixing heaviness and lightness, give a picture of autumn which turns out to be a part of an elaborate simile of the colorful spring carnival which opens the poem. "The Poet" is written with quiet nonchalance in the use of rhyme and rhythmic variations. However, the poem's carnival is only a background to the three lone and sad figures: the poet, the water nymph (*rusalka*), and the Mother of God. Paganism, Christianity and poetry are clearly the outcasts in the post-revolutionary world of crowds and science.

Echoes of crisis and disillusionment are still heard in "The Sylvan Sadness" (*Lesnaya toska*), Khlebnikov's last mythological poem and last idyll. Written in the form of an operatic libretto, this is primarily a poem of sound, but under this display of sonic splendor there is deep sadness, and it is the poet's sad-

ness, since none of the fantastic creatures that populate the poem is sad. It is Khlebnikov's farewell to his beloved world of pagan mythology, a yearning for a paradise lost, and there is irony in the arrival of the morning at the end of the poem. The morning is too simple, too realistic, too trivial and it drives away all those likable villas, water nymphs and wood-goblins.

With the disappearance of pagan mythology, paganism remains still in Khlebnikov's watercolor-like "Three Sisters" (*Tri sestry*), his shortest *poema*. Here, in the portraits of his three friends, one finds water nymphs and ancient Slavic amazons who only pretend to be women of our century. This pantheistic idyll may be an escape on the part of the poet from the grim realities of the Civil War. It is unusually lyrical and puts unusual stress on religious imagery, which, in its complexity, stands in contrast to the simplicity of conception and style.

The last, and longest, of the Kharkov poems, "Ladomir," is an ambitious work which was meant to be an encyclopedia of Khlebnikov's ideas on and dreams about the future of mankind. It has been called "the sum total of Khlebnikov's poetry" (Ty-nyanov), and is a rather belated, really Futurist work by a poet whose love for the past had tended, until then, to make him a contradictory figure, with the exception of his one poem about the future: the grim fantasy "The Crane." Whereas Khadzhi-Tarkhan was a city of beloved past, Ladomir is the name of the city of the future, where universal harmony is achieved and technological and scientific progress helps mankind towards its ultimate happiness. Khlebnikov the Utopian, the author of fantastic projects, a revolutionary, a rationalist idyllist, displays here the infinite variety and richness of his outlandish ideas and gives poetic realization to his numerous dreams. The poem appears to be a disorderly succession of passages, with a chaotic mixture of past and future, repetitious and overly long; but in this conglomeration there is a distinct direction and movement. It is like a procession, multicolored, heterogeneous, but advancing step by step. This loud picture of the future which can be identified with socialism, containing anti-religious passages and poster-like denunciations of the tsarist past, could not fail to produce bravos on the part of the Soviet critics. But it is even

more interesting in its maintaining the tone of the eighteenth-century ode, echoing the ideas of the philosopher Nikolai Fyodorov (1828-1903) and the mathematician Nikolai Lobachevsky (1792-1856), playing with proper names, dialect words and slang as well as making moderate use of his own "trans-rational language" (*zaum*). In many respects, in this *poema* Khlebnikov seems to be taking his last inventory before saying good-bye to the old devices.

The ten poems written after Kharkov, form a definitely new stage in Khlebnikov's development. Contemporary themes dominate now. Even more than that, most poems of this time are about what Khlebnikov actually saw. The previous fantasies give place to a clear vision of things before him. One may call it "realism" if one likes, but the very intensity of this realism makes one remember Dostoevsky's famous words about being "a realist in a higher sense." Primitivistic technique is now abandoned almost completely; direct vision reigns instead of literary controversy, game or dream as was the case before. The very fact of Khlebnikov's wanderings through Caucasus and Iran during these years (1920-1921) may partly account for this fact: he was alone in the wide world, far from the literary circles of Moscow and Petrograd.

However, "Razin," the first draft of which was written when Khlebnikov was still in Kharkov, is more in the old tradition of a literary game. It is probably the longest palindromic poem in the world, in which each of its 408 lines also reads backwards. Though an exception among Khlebnikov's *poemy*, "Razin" is only an attempt to enlarge upon what Khlebnikov tried to do before on a smaller scale. It can also be easily placed in the context of Russian Futurism, Russian folklore and the now still largely ignored baroque tradition. But for Khlebnikov it was more than a verbal exercise. It was a comparison of two destinies, Stepan Razin's and his own, which are identical, but which are moving in opposite directions. It is also a series of magnificent tableaux depicting Razin's story. Despite the fact that the palindromic structure seems bound to hamper the natural flow of poetic emotion, some parts are seething with energy, and the poem's

consonantism is naturally and properly rough, barbaric, and picturesque.

One of Khlebnikov's supreme masterpieces is "Gul-mullah's Trumpet" (*Truba gul-mully*), the poetic diary of his visit to Persia with the Red Army in 1921. Hardly anything in Russian poetry approximates it in directness of poetic vision. It develops simultaneously on the symbolic and on the realistic levels, and all details seen by the poet have the quality of being seen for the first time, with eyes wide open. Khlebnikov had dreamt about the Orient all his life, and here it was right before him. The poem sings all the way through as befits the fulfillment of a life-time dream. These jottings-down are full of a special kind of lyricism which leaves reality's outlines and colors intact but makes them more intense than in "real life." Pure enjoyment of this kind can only be found in the works of European poets on their first visits to Italy.

The next three *poemy* from what sometimes is called Khlebnikov's "triptych of retribution" (a theme which attracted Khlebnikov long before the Revolution), and they are all about the Russian Revolution of 1917. They are essentially unfinished drafts, and between two of them it is even hard to draw a line: they are two versions of the same plan. The post-Kharkov period gave birth to Khlebnikov's best and worst poetry. These three are among the most unsuccessful ones, full of propagandistic crudities and even betraying a certain lack of interest on the part of the author. The meaning of the Revolution is simple for Khlebnikov: the nobility and the rich pay for their past sins. This theme sounds clearly in the long-winded "The Night Before the Soviets" (*Noch pered Sovetami*), which is a conversation between a nervous noblewoman (kind, compassionate and even with a leftist political past, but doomed and destined to pay for the crimes of her ancestors) and her old housekeeper who does not spare her mistress's feelings by prophesying that she will be hanged. The greater part of this work is taken up by the old woman's story of her grandmother, who was ordered by her master to breast-feed young puppies. This part is unbearably long, written in a slipshod manner and contains too much of cheap melodrama. The only interesting element is the influence

of the poet N. A. Nekrasov. The second poem, "The Washerwoman" (*Prachka*), is a disorganized mass of raw material, but it is perfectly clear that Khlebnikov's idea of the real forces of the Revolution is far from the orthodox Soviet viewpoint. For him the Revolution is made by and for the *Lumpenproletariat*, and he portrays in detail the beggars and the underworld who, before the rebellion, found shelter amid piles of warm horse-dung at the city dump in Petersburg. The other side of the conflict is presented in "The Present" (*Nastoyashchee*), the most finished and successful work of the triptych. The old regime is symbolized in the Grand Duke, who is presented as a tragic figure, somewhat naïve, but unquestionably noble in his stoic acceptance of the retribution. In striking contrast is the second part, a series of choruses after the Grand Duke's monologue. It is extremely rich in inflections and declamatory forms which anticipate many later attempts by Soviet poets (e.g., Ilya Selvinsky's phonetic experiments and songs in Mayakovsky's "It's Good!").

The theme of "A Night Search" (*Nochnoi obysk*) is still the Revolution as retribution, but it is a far cry from the triptych. In fact, it is the peak of Khlebnikov's tragic art. This is a picture of a search by revolutionary sailors of a bourgeois apartment, during which they shoot a young officer and are later burned alive by his mother. No other Soviet poet would dare to write this tale in which a Red learns courage from a White and uses it in a Nietzschean combat with God, of which the outcome remains an enigma. Khlebnikov, in a truly tragic, objective way, takes no sides. He only shows how metaphysical symbols grow out of a "real life" incident, how the old sailor's drunken babbling is transformed into a mystic vision and how both Whites and Reds find death in the fire of anarchistic uprising. The eschatological finale could hardly be expected from the author of rationalistic utopias.

On the other hand, "The Coast of Slaves" (*Nevolnichy bereg*) is Khlebnikov's most abortive work, an uninteresting propagandistic melodrama, written without inner conviction. It is a pacifist poem about the soldiers of World War I who are selected in a manner similar to that used by slave traders and who later return home as cripples.

Among the late poems, "Razin's Boat" (*Ustrug Razina*) occupies a place similar to that of "Ladomir" in the Kharkov period. After having established a new style, Khlebnikov suddenly returns here to old standards and devices. Having struck a tragic note in the works on contemporary themes, he relaxes in the old primitivism applied to history. The dynamism of the poems on the Revolution gives way here to static portraiture and stylized description. It is rather "classic" in its brevity and semantic compactness, forming a contrast to the "romantic" outbursts, repetitions, and ramifications of poems like "A Night Search." The verse of the old days is used instead of the free rhapsodic lines of the other late poems. But it is also unquestionably a work of the late period in its violence and premonitions of death, its greater integration of old devices into the texture and its two passages where the 1921 famine is projected upon the seventeenth century of Razin. The *poema* follows the plot of the popular song "Iz-za ostrova na strezhen," which seems to be its real source rather than A. K. Tolstoy and the historical songs about Razin which are usually mentioned by scholars. Moreover, the song's four-foot trochee is also the dominant meter of the poem. The poem is saturated with sound and is full of most interesting alliterative effects.

The last two *poemy* of Khlebnikov occupy a special place among the works of the late period. Clearly, a new period is entered with these two poems, a period which was destined, however, to remain undeveloped because of the poet's death six months later. Its originality consists mainly in a new use of free verse which will be analysed later. Both poems were written in Moscow in 1922. "The Coup d'Etat in Vladivostok" (*Per-evorot v Vladivostoke*) uses the entrance of Japanese troops into Vladivostok for its theme and is based on his friend, the poet Aseev's, stories of his sojourn in the Far East in 1918-19. Khlebnikov's enthusiasm for the East never included Japan. This time the poet obviously shows his fascination while observing Oriental evil as embodied in the figure of a Japanese soldier, and he lavishes some of his most elaborate imagery on this soldier.

The second poem, "The Blue Chains" (*Sinie okovy*) is Khlebnikov's longest and, in parts, most obscure. It also uses Aseev's

stories about the Far East, but most of it describes or hints at events and small details of the poet's frequent visits to the country home of the Sinyakov sisters in the Ukraine (three of these sisters are portrayed in his poem "Three Sisters"). Khlebnikov's theories on the repetition of historical events are also an important part of the work. As a whole, it is one vast synthesis of Khlebnikov's efforts in more fields than one. His life, his dreams, his theories and his art are here merged in one, and the poem moves like a big river, from association to association, changing shape under way. It is astonishingly optimistic and full of healthy, though not necessarily subtle, humor. The life affirmation has never been so strong or exuberant in the otherwise stylized, archaic, theoretical, or tragic works of Khlebnikov, and one is surprised to find this serenity in a sick man who, after years of privations, is disillusioned upon his arrival in Moscow, shortly before his terrible death.

The doors opened by Khlebnikov in his last poems, especially in rhythm and imagery, attracted no one. Russian poets had only begun to cultivate the results of his early, primitivistic work (N. Tikhonov, Zabolotsky) when the heavy hand of Socialist Realism halted the natural evolution of Russian literature. The discovery of Khlebnikov's late achievements may be the task of a distant future. Khlebnikov refuses to become the past of Russian poetry even in this manner.

III

The preceding was a perfunctory and incomplete survey of Khlebnikov's longer poems (*poemy*). It ignores his unfinished works and does not take into consideration works called by the poet "supertales," such as "The Otter's Children" (*Deti Vydry*) and "War in a Mousetrap" (*Voyna v myshelovke*). This survey had largely to ignore formal aspects, but even an enumeration such as this cannot help but produce an impression of unusual poetic scope and wealth.

One who has read all of Khlebnikov's *poemy* feels himself a discoverer. He has entered a new world of poetry, original and rich in substance, but he also remains haunted by several ideas

— by two in particular. Firstly, Khlebnikov is not only and not in the first place a rebel, an inventor and an experimenter. He is the man of unique poetic vision and a creator of his own great poetic universe, and the key to this universe has to be sought right in these *poemy*. They seem to be an unconscious outlet for his poetic energy, whereas his more famous (or notorious) experimental sketches serve only as a laboratory. This laboratory may be exciting for scholars, especially for linguists, and poets — though it may not interest all of them — but it remains a laboratory, and not poetry itself. Similarly, a student of Bryusov will probably find more in his *Urbi et Orbi* rather than in his *Experiments (Opyty)*. The fact that Khlebnikov could not, for years, find true recognition commensurate with his real stature, can be explained only if one realizes that the wrong part of his work was placed in the limelight. The author of the tragedy "A Night Search" was too often considered a poetic engineer and the poet of "I and E," which is a filigree and a gem, was almost dismissed as a queer genius or inarticulate madman of poetry. All this does not mean that Khlebnikov's experiments are unimportant or uninteresting, but they are simply not the part with which to begin his study.

What is displayed before us in Khlebnikov's *poemy* and what makes him a great poet is not primarily his verbal ingenuity and intuition or his ideas. Experiment is reduced to a minimum in them, and for a really good illustration of his nationalistic, historical, mathematical and linguistic ideas one has to look elsewhere. It is the vision of the world which is full of harmony and serenity, but can be found only in the past or in the future. Khlebnikov was an idyllist who lived in a tragic time. He did not try to escape this tragedy, and it alternates or merges with idyll in his works, but he considered harmonious existence as more natural and certainly more desirable for mankind. This makes him a truer Futurist than most of his colleagues.

The second thought that haunts one upon becoming familiar with Khlebnikov's *poemy* can rather categorically be worded thus: a scholar or a critic who is interested in basic problems of Russian poetry can seriously misunderstand some of the most important developments in it if he passes Khlebnikov without

giving him credit. If, for example, one studies the modern Russian epic tradition or the evolution of the basic meters as well as of rhyme in the eighteenth-twentieth centuries, and forgets Khlebnikov, his maps of Russian literature will contain large blank spots in the most crucial areas. The following will seek to show why this is so.

IV

The brilliant Formalist scholar Yury Tynyanov once said that "speaking of Khlebnikov it is possible to ignore Futurism." It is certainly possible when one deals with his *poemy*, because in them he appears to be the central figure not of the Futurist movement but of the Russian epic tradition of the twentieth century.

His epic characteristics have been noticed by many penetrating critics and scholars. N. Gumilev wrote in 1914 about Khlebnikov: "Many of his lines seem to be fragments of some never-written epic." Tynyanov called him "our only epic poet of the twentieth-century." Roman Jakobson has said: "Khlebnikov gave a new kind of epic, the first genuinely epic works after many decades of stagnation . . . Khlebnikov is epical despite our anti-epic time." Sir Maurice Bowra has spoken of "broken epics by Khlebnikov."

Those who attempted an analysis of those epic characteristics usually mentioned two traits. One of them was often called "impersonality" or "objectivity." D. S. Mirsky said that "I" never becomes a poetic theme with Khlebnikov. His poetry, Mirsky continued, grows not from emotion or a mood, but is based on intellectual generalization. In this, Mirsky believed, he is close to Schiller and Whitman, and among Russians, to Lomonosov, Sluchevsky and Konevskoy. G. Vinokur called Khlebnikov "an impersonal poet." Osip Mandelstam, however, spoke of Khlebnikov's objectivity in different terms: "Khlebnikov does not know what a contemporary means. He is a citizen of all history, of the whole structure of language and poetry. He is an idiotic Einstein who cannot make out what is nearer, a railroad bridge or the *Igor-Tale*."

Another word which often emerges in discussion of Khlebnikov is "mosaic." The Soviet scholar A. Metchenko noticed "a mosaic" quality even in Khlebnikov's major works. Khlebnikov's friend, the poet D. Petrovsky, called his work "a mosaic of his biography." Roman Jakobson has said: "Even his small poems make an impression of epic fragments, and Khlebnikov, without any effort, used to put them together into a *poema*." It was obviously with this in mind that Vladimir Mayakovsky even paradoxically proclaimed: "There are no *poemy* among Khlebnikov's works." Mayakovsky himself always remained a lyrical poet even in his attempts to create an epic, and so he could not accept as *poemy* Khlebnikov's works which lacked psychological unity. But Khlebnikov had an inherent tendency toward larger-size poetry; therefore, he could conceive of small-size poetry only as fragments. During his closer association with the Futurist movement he may have had a wish to destroy the traditional forms, but actually his supreme ideal always remained super-harmony, *i.e.*, heterogeneous elements finally united on a higher level, as in his "supertales." This is not a lyrical trait, whose *sine qua non* is unity of emotion or mood.

Practically the same thing is usually meant when critics speak about Khlebnikov's method of "stringing" (*nanizyvanie*), which is so typical of many of his *poemy* and which probably crystallized and had its first application in "A Game in Hell." "Stringing," or simply the adding of lines and pieces of text to one another, is particularly evident in "Khadzhi Tarkhan." The coordinating conjunctions seem to be accidental, replaceable by any other. For example, in the line "No zvuk pechalno gorlovoi," "no" (but) is not related to what was said before, it just connects. Thus the poem flows like the Volga it describes, having no structure, only direction. This quality made Osip Mandelstam exaggerate a little when he said that in Khlebnikov "each line is the beginning of a new poem." In the same context, the Italian scholar A. M. Ripellino remarked: "*Tutte i poemi di Chlébnikov si vanno construendo con una sorte di fatalità vegetale.*" Another good example of "stringing" can be found in the post-revolutionary *poema* "Ladomir." Elements of this truly epic quality can further be found even in the works of some nine-

teenth-century Russian prose-writers such as N. Leskov. One can also observe them in Gogol's *Dead Souls* and Leo Tolstoy's *War and Peace*, whose epic traits were no secret to their authors.

Recent research in the history of Russian *poema* (A. N. Sokolov, *Ocherki po istorii russkoi poemy XVIII i pervoii poloviny XIX veka*, Moscow, 1955) tries to postulate as the basic feature of the *poema* a glorification or praise of an event or person. In a deeper, poetic sense this was stated by Rainer Maria Rilke as the necessary condition of any poetry ("O sage, Dichter, was du tust? — Ich rühme"). However, within the epic tradition, not only Khlebnikov, but also the mock-heroic poem, the novel in verse, the tale (*povest*) in verse, the didactic poem and the "light" poem would be disqualified under such conditions.

For Khlebnikov, a *poema* was of large size in the first place (although in English the word "length" fits poetry better, I shall speak about "size" because of wider implications). Size has rarely been considered an important esthetic factor, but actually it is a decisive one. Size makes the difference between a statuette and a monument. No modern miracles in the field of reproduction of painting would recreate for us, say, Alexander Ivanov's "Appearance of Christ before the Multitudes" because they would never attempt to repeat the original tremendous size. Some scholars have had to admit that in Russian prose the difference between *roman* and *povest* is often a matter of sheer length. Lyrical genres are, in general, of smaller size than epic ones.

The eighteenth-century was a century of large-size poetry in Russia. Even the ode, a lyrical genre, had dimensions which would later be considered proper only for an epic poem. (Here, by the way, was a latent possibility for the *liricheskaya poema* which was to develop later.) But an average eighteenth-century ode was never longer than an average epic *poema*. In the nineteenth century, we observe both a reduction in size of the *poema* and a tendency for this genre to die out. Even on the lyrical plane, large size was given a mortal blow by F. Tyutchev, who fragmentized the ode. And within the field of true epic, it is enough to compare the length of Pushkin's "Russlan and Ludmilla" (1820) with his "The Bronze Horseman" (1833) or the

very quantity of *poemy* written by Lermontov in his youth with those written during his poetic maturity. Despite a number of second-rate stylizations, a successful *poema* became almost a rarity in the second half of the nineteenth-century. It is not an accident that Nekrasov's "Who Lives Well in Russia" stands like a tower of Babel in the surrounding landscape, an unfinished mammoth work, despite its author's true epic genius. Paradoxically, another poet with true epic characteristics, Alexey K. Tolstoy, mainly displayed his epic tendencies in his relatively short ballads. It is interesting to observe that, at the time when epic tradition was stronger, the lyrical Zhukovsky's ballad was masquerading as an epic, whereas A. K. Tolstoy's *poemy* wear the garb of ballads. The era of Symbolism brought *poema* to a virtual standstill, though many Symbolists attempted this genre. But very soon there began a groping for a new kind of large-size poetry. The lyric poet Alexander Blok attempts both an imitation of traditional form in "Retribution" (1910-1921) and a new type of lyrical *poema* in "The Twelve" (1918), in which a "mosaic" structure is successfully merged with the objectivity of a classic tragedy (it has the classic unities, a minimum of characters, and even, if one wishes, a *deus ex machina* at the end), without loosing its lyrical sweep. Another successful, though stylized, attempt was made by Andrey Bely in his "First Meeting" (1921). It is significant that in both cases an attempt at a revival of *poema* was made when the author was in his late period, at a time when a new need for large-size poetry was obviously strongly felt.

Amid all this activity Khlebnikov stands as a unique figure. Completely unnoticed by most of his contemporaries and largely undervalued by his friends and successors (and by himself), his three dozen *poemy* actually form the backbone of this important tendency of the period. Only by taking them into consideration can we understand the subsequent flourishing of the *poema* in the 1920's, which shows that the poetic renaissance of the Russian twentieth-century started lyrically, but ended epically. Virtually every poet of importance attempted (and more often than not attempted successfully) large-size poetry. Significantly, these attempts date in most cases from their later

years. It is enough to enumerate the names of V. Mayakovsky, S. Esenin, N. Tikhonov, I. Selvinsky, E. Bagritsky, N. Klyuev, N. Zabolotsky, S. Kirsanov, and N. Aseev. Even the essentially lyrical B. Pasternak and O. Mandelstam display this tendency.

Khlebnikov's *poema* stands in the center of the twentieth-century revival of large-size poetry, showing points of affinity with Russian poetry of both the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries. It is impossible here to develop these themes, but in their light many details would become significant, among them Khlebnikov's mastery of color, especially in "Khadzhi-Tarkhan" and "The Poet." In his essay on Tyutchev (*Uraniya*, Leningrad, 1928) the scholar L. Pumpyansky speaks interestingly about the Russian tradition of coloristics starting with Derzhavin and going through Tyutchev and Fet to Vyacheslav Ivanov. And Vyacheslav Ivanov, let us add, was one of the major influences in Khlebnikov's work. One may also add that Khlebnikov showed an unerring sense for the nineteenth-century tradition in choosing Alexey K. Tolstoy as one of his favorite poets and important influences as well.

V

Khlebnikov's *poemy* occupy a very important place in the history of Russian primitivism. This history has not been studied; nor is there a good definition of what constitutes primitivism, especially in literature. It is clearer, and easier to speak about it, in painting, particularly after French and American primitivists have achieved great popularity. In Russia, in the early 1910's, a group of artists became interested in imitating children's drawings, old popular lithographs (*lubok*) and signboards. Among them were Natalya Goncharova, Mikhail Larionov and David Burliuk. Burliuk, one of the creators of Russian Futurism, continued to be attracted by primitivism in many of the paintings done during his American period.

The beginnings of Khlebnikov's primitivism can be found in his ballads "Juno's Lover" and "Alchak," the latter being an imitation of primitive popular songs. "The Tsar's Bride," probably the earliest of his *poemy*, displays many characteristics of

this trend; however, this is only one form of primitivism, which can be termed "infantilism." While reading the poem, with its unmotivated transitions from one tableau to another, with its elliptic sentences, full of grammatical and stylistic lapses, verbal and metric mixing, and use of non-standard forms, one cannot escape the general impression of a child reading a book for adults, in which he sees and understands some parts and elements clearly enough, but distorts and misinterprets others. It is interesting to note that when the manuscript of "The Tsar's Bride" was already in the hands of the publisher of *Sadok sudey* 2, Khlebnikov insistently asked him to drop the poem from the publication and to print instead verses by a thirteen-year-old girl from Astrakhan, to which the publisher finally agreed. In this case, Khlebnikov might have had in mind a substitution of genuine infantilism for the artificial variety. He did not lose his interest in infantilistic poetry after this, and in his later years practiced and developed it (cf. the poem "Sea" with the lines "Sudnu va-va, more byaka/ more sdelalo bo-bo").

The flowering of primitivism in Khlebnikov's *poemy* begins with his "Stone Age" poems of 1911, "The Forest Maiden" and "I and E," which can be easily connected with the atmosphere of the period that produced N. Roerich's paintings and Igor Stravinsky's "Le sacre du printemps" (1913). In France, also in 1911, the novelist J. H. Rosny, Sr. published his "Stone Age" novel, *La guerre du feu*, which soon became popular in a Russian translation. It may be that this common interest helped N. Gumilev find words of appreciation for "I and E." He wrote in *Apollon* that Khlebnikov "loves and knows how to write about times long past; he knows how to use their images." Quoting the hero's soliloquy about the attack of the beast, Gumilev exclaimed, "In the rhythm and in the confused syntax one cannot fail to visualize a frightened savage, to hear his excited speech."

Khlebnikov attains his primitivistic goals in a great variety of ways. Details of the narrative in "The Forest Maiden," for instance, are full of naïveté, which sometimes reminds one of the Parisian *douanier* Henri Rousseau. The rivals' fight is a furious one, so that after it "the whole surface of the earth is covered with holes" from uprooted trees. The heroine, however, is sound

asleep during all this time, after the exhausting *rendez-vous*. Still, the victor wakes her up with a mere kiss on her breast. Since he has hidden his identity behind the dead man's beard, which he has pasted (!) on his face, the girl accepts his love-making without any protest ("No daleka ot nizkogo kovarstva/ Ona rastochaet molodosti tsarstvo"). When she discovers the deception and her lover's death, she accuses the murderer thus:

Zachem ubil lyubimtsa grez?
Esli net sredstv primirit,
Ya by mogla by razdelit,
Emu dala by vecher, k tebe khodila b po utram.

It is only natural that whenever ideological elements come into the picture, as, for instance, in "I and E" and "The End of Atlantis," they are presented in an inconclusive, vague or confusing way. I and E are ready to sacrifice their lives, but the reader can never find out exactly why. This is further confused by the anachronistic inclusion of Christian motifs in this prehistoric poem. Likewise, the priest and the slave girl in the second poem are observed from aside: each of them has "ideology," but it is not clear to the end and it is not the message of the poem.

Some of the devices of the *lubok* are consciously applied in the poems, e.g., the coloring beyond the outlines (*protekayushchaya raskraska*) as in "*I persey belizna struitsya do stupeney*." Kruchenykh, who collaborated with Khlebnikov in writing the poem "A Game in Hell," called it "an imitation of the *lubok*," and the first edition of the poem was illustrated by Mikhail Larionov, who at that time was a primitivist in his painting.

Among other means for achieving primitivism, mention should be made of anticipation and amassing of a single color. An event is often predicted before it happens, usually without any need to do so. This extends from conventional cases, like "*Seychas vkrug spyashchey nachnetsya secha*" or "*Predtecheyu utekh drozhit tsevnitsa*" to the more unexpected "*S ney vdvoem/ . . . / Sidel pevets — chrez chas uzh trup*." Amassing of color is achieved by frequent repetition. For example, in the first sixteen lines of "The Tsar's Bride" the adjectives *bely* (white) and *nezhny* (tender), together with words suggesting

the same quality, flow through the lines. Vowels and consonants in these lines also follow this method of amassing by simple repetition. The same can be observed at the beginning of "Malusha's Granddaughter," where adjectives with connotations of gaiety and joy are crowded into a few lines. All these devices are strengthened by special rhythmical "shifts" (*sdvigi*) which may aim, in this case, at producing the impression of helplessness in versification.

The predominant genre of Khlebnikov's primitivism is the idyll. In "A Villa and a Wood-Goblin," "A Witch-Doctor and Venus," and "Sylvan Sadness" it is a mythological idyll; in "Rural Charm" and "Three Sisters" the idyll contains realistic elements. After the Revolution, however, a tragic vision of the world grew in Khlebnikov, and in his late poems the idyll virtually disappeared.

Khlebnikov's idyllic primitivism was imitated and developed by the Soviet poet Nikolay Zabolotsky (1903-1958), especially in his "Triumph of Agriculture" (*Torzhestvo zemledeliya*), but the history of Russian primitivism cannot be reduced to the Khlebnikov variety alone. It also includes the émigré poets Yury Odarchenko (b. 1890) and, partially, Victor Mamchenko (b. 1901). And there were other primitivists in the past. Elements of *lubok* can be found in N. Leskov's "The Steel Flea" and other stories. The Russian idyllic tradition of Gnedich-Delvig-A. Maykov is entirely outside primitivism, but one unexpectedly discovers primitivism in N. Gogol's idyll "Hans Küchelgarten," which is undeservedly neglected and usually dismissed as an abortive work. Careful analysis reveals genuine primitivism here side by side with conventional romanticism. Not only whole lines, but whole passages sound like Khlebnikov and Zabolotsky with their absurd imagery, semantic oxymorons and "incorrect" prosody. Literary influence is out of the question in this case, bringing one to the conclusion that there must be something "timeless" in primitivistic devices. It would be fascinating to look for traces of primitivism in the rest of Gogol's work. At any rate, "Hans Küchelgarten" gains in stature when viewed from the primitivistic standpoint, and "the lack of literary skill" displayed in it turns out to be a system of devices aiming at producing a definite impression on the reader.

VI

It is indeed a surprising fact that scholars have consistently avoided Khlebnikov in their studies of Russian metrics, because, unless he is considered, many developments in Russian verse simply remain obscure.

Khlebnikov's contemporary, D. Varravin, noticed in 1916 (*Moskovskie mastera*) two outstanding features of his verse: the combining of binary and ternary meters in a single poem and the habit of placing stressed syllables together (*i.e.*, using spondees). Both observations are correct, but there is more in Khlebnikov's verse than this alone. Moreover, neither feature is a novelty in Russian versification. The former was occasionally practiced by Tyutchev, and the latter can be found in abundance in eighteenth-century Russian poetry.

Khlebnikov is a greater and a more consistent mixer than almost any of his predecessors, his only rivals being Derzhavin and Trediakovsky; and this includes mixing in other fields besides meter. As to the verse that he uses in his *poemy*, it is a mixture of the five basic Russian meters. However, the ternary meters can be considered one element, because they are less distinguishable to the ear when used in mixture, a fact noted by some scholars. This results in a clash or interaction not of all five meters, but only of three: iambic, trochaic, and the complex ternary group, in which the amphibrach usually dominates, probably owing to its intermediary nature. With less conviction, one could even claim identity of iamb and trochee, which actually was done by Trediakovsky, but in Russian poetry, with very few exceptions such as some *chastushki*, it would be difficult to find evidence for it. The fact remains, that normally iamb and trochee do not mix well for the Russian ear. On the other hand, in English prosody, this is an accepted procedure, which can be observed in the so-called "beheading." All in all, the three above-mentioned metrical groups stand out clearly in Khlebnikov's verse, and it would be wrong to consider this conscious mixture a type of accentual verse similar to *dolniki* or to Mayakovsky's verse.

There have been many attempts to describe or to define

Khlebnikov's verse. The poet N. Aseev wrote that "Khlebnikov changes meter in almost every line," which is an exaggeration. The critic D. Talnikov mentioned Khlebnikov's "orientation on 'metrical verse' with constant shifts," which is not a bad description. The scholar Yury Tynyanov wrote of "the variable system of Khlebnikov's verse," which was later repeated by N. Khardzhiev, the best Khlebnikov scholar in Russia. The late B. Tomashhevsky, abandoning metrical terminology, called the phenomenon "scrap structure" (*kuskovaya kompozitsiya*) adding that it "freely combines lines which satisfy different metrical norms, but it combines them in such a way that the metrical norm of each line is easily discernible." One can hardly agree with the last part of this statement, considering what happens to ternary lines in this mixture. There is more unity to this problem, however, than there seems at first, especially if one regards the identity of iamb and trochee as at least a possibility. Referring to Khlebnikov, the Soviet critic Innokenty Oksenov tried to introduce the term "all-metrical rhythm" (*vsemetricheskii ritm*). In the same context, the émigré critic L. Gomolicky used the term "synthetical meter." This verse can be called "variational iamb" with much more clarity, however, because this term would suggest that iamb dominates in this structure and even assimilates foreign elements.

If one compares the verse of Khlebnikov's "metrical" poems (*i.e.*, excluding those written in free verse), one cannot fail to notice that the great majority of them is written in one predominate meter, the classic Russian iambic tetrameter, which almost invariably starts and ends a *poema*, thus establishing the "tonality" and providing the work with a coda. Herein lies the importance of Khlebnikov's *poemy*. On the one hand they show a destruction of traditional verse, a step towards free verse; on the other hand they are a development of the basic meter of Russian poetry for two hundred years. Khlebnikov had an astonishing capacity to remain an important link in tradition even when he was innovating.

All this does not exhaust the Khlebnikov verse. Other things occur within the lines, and most of them are unusual or extremely rare procedures in Russian verse. They can be termed

"rhythrical shifts" (*sdvigи*), and the most important among them are the following:

1) transferred accent, or syncopation, which is normally allowed in the first foot in Russian iamb only if it starts with a monosyllabic word (as in Pushkin's "*Boy barabanny, voy i skre-zhet*"). Shy attempts to start such lines with a disyllabic word can be found in Russian poetry of the nineteenth and even of the twentieth century only with great difficulty. Khlebnikov uses it constantly, and the following iambic lines are no exception in his *poemy*:

*Khrama lyubvi blestyat chertogi
Smotrit soperniku v litso.*

They may even affect feet other than the first:

Vnutri blistaet chertog nog;

2) substitution, or a ternary foot in a binary line:

*Seychas vkrug spyashchey nachnetsya secha
Ee oskorbil moguchy rok;*

3) spondees, which often remind one of Derzhavin's:

*Davno zver silny nad kosuley
Povis lik dlinno-voskovoy.*

It may be noted that all these procedures are perfectly acceptable in traditional English verse. To these, one can add lame feet, prose lines in a verse environment (later extensively developed by N. Zabolotsky), a variable number of feet in lines, so called "delayed" anacrases, and very original types of *enjambement*. Some of these devices are apt to serve, occasionally, onomatopoetic purposes, as in

*Molvil Belun, vzglyad glaz vperiyaya dolgy
I zasuetilisya kholopy
Ona plechami vzdragivaet v rydanyi
O vlast, khokhochi ili ne khokhochi.*

Khlebnikov's metrics and rhythm developed in a complex way. Not a single one of his three dozen *poemy* entirely repeats the patterns and combinations of the preceding ones, and, viewed in its entirety, it is a fascinating spectacle of rhythm seeking to realize itself. Efforts to abandon his earlier system of "variational iamb" are particularly visible during the Kharkov

period when Khlebnikov in some *poemys* came close to traditional verse (even to the point of observing strict caesura not only in Alexandrine lines, but also in iambic pentameters) and abandoned all "shifts," in others began to build on trochee and amphibrach instead of iamb, in still others returned to the "varitional iamb."

With very few exceptions, Khlebnikov's late poems are written in free verse, of which he was the greatest and the most diverse practitioner. It is simply impossible to study Russian free verse without taking Khlebnikov into consideration. First examples of free verse on the Russian soil were translations (esp., those of H. Heine's *Nordsee*), and these translations gave birth to some humorous poetry, as for instance, in Turgenev's letter to A. Fet. But the actual introduction of free verse to Russian poetry was done by V. Bryusov under the influence of the French Symbolist *verslibrists*. After that, it was used by some of the leading poets of Russian poetic renaissance of the twentieth century. Perhaps the purest and the most successful example is A. Blok's "*Ona prishla s moroza*" (1908). M. Kuzmin's "Songs of Alexandria" (*Aleksandriyskie pesni*), which appeared in 1906, is a well-known example of a book of poems written entirely in free verse. Only Blok, Kuzmin, and Akhmatova are mentioned by Professor B. Unbegaun in his *Russian Versification*, who, moreover, considers free verse a special case of unrhymed verse, almost a metrical freak, perhaps not verse at all, but rhythmical prose. Khlebnikov is not mentioned nor are N. Gumilev ("*Moi chitateli*") or O. Mandelstam ("*Nashedshy podkovu*"). And, incidentally, Khlebnikov proves in his *poemys* that rhyme is largely immaterial in free verse.

As we have seen, the outstanding feature of Khlebnikov's *poemys* was a predominance of some classical meter, usually iambic tetrameter, in a metrically heterogeneous environment. No matter how unorthodox, all of his innovations had such a skeleton as their starting point. Yet elements of free verse occasionally appeared even in his early *poemys*, notably in "The Crane." The preparation of free verse is more noticeable in some of the Kharkov *poemys*, especially in certain unusual kinds of caesura ("A Night in a Trench") and in combinations of 2-

and 3-foot measures in one line ("A Stone Woman," "The Poet").

In the late poems Khlebnikov abandoned a metrical basis entirely and built his verse on the line as a unit, which seems to be the most essential thing in free verse. Free verse based on a natural combination of different meters is established as the predominant one in "Gul-mullah's Trumpet." In the earlier works the same device resulted in "shifts": contrasting meters revealed their opposite nature and clashed with each other because of their combination within the stable, "ideal" metrical frame of iambic tetrameter. Now there is a change of metrical pattern in almost every line, but the whole idea of meter loses its meaning because there is no metrical predominance. Lines freely follow the rhythm of sentences. However, at this stage Khlebnikov stylizes his free verse in different ways. Here, for instance, there is a certain dactylic cadence producing the impression of Russian dactylic hexameter with its epic connotations. In the poems of "the triptych of retribution" and in "A Night Search" various kinds of *raeshnik* verse are imitated in combination with certain types of spoken Russian such as oratorical or conversational.

The sheer bulk (almost ten *poemy*) and variety (at least four different types of free verse) should make Khlebnikov the central figure in any discussion of Russian free verse. He is obviously more important in this respect than M. Kuzmin, who is usually mentioned first. Still, the origins of Khlebnikov's free verse may go back to Kuzmin, his admitted master. Khlebnikov's first attempt at free verse, in 1909, is not only an imitation of Kuzmin's, but is even addressed to him ("K Vam"). Another influence must have been Walt Whitman, who is often mentioned in connection with Khlebnikov's early work "At the Zoo" (*Zverinets*). At that time Khlebnikov certainly knew Whitman in the Russian translation by K. Chukovsky, which appeared in 1907, and it is understandable that he might be attracted by the American poet's pantheistic mood. In 1921, the period of Khlebnikov's late *poemy*, he "liked to listen to readings from Whitman in English, though he had difficulties in understanding the language" (from memoirs).

But it is in his last two *Poemy* that Khlebnikov achieves the ultimate degree of freedom in his free verse after the stylization and mixtures in his previous efforts. Now the verse simply moves along, changing pace as the poet feels the need. Any meter may appear and even stay for a while, either in its pure form, or replete with "shifts," but in the long run this is all dissolved in one forceful movement. The thematic analysis shows fragments, separate pictures and episodes, but now they are parts of a moving whole; there is no longer any "stringing." The analysis of separate lines shows that iamb also dominates here, but separate lines do not count very much in this type of "super verse" and do not associate themselves with any traditional forms based on the iamb. Probably units larger than a line are decisive here, but there seems to be no means for singling them out. At any rate, the predominance of iamb may be a natural tendency towards the most flexible of Russian meters. The important thing, however, is that it is entirely different from the predominance of iamb in the early *poemy*. There the classic iamb was bulged from within by various "shifts," the verse sounded sometimes in the traditional, "beautiful" way, and at other times it got lost in inarticulateness and clumsiness. In the last *poemy*, if one analyzes a line from the old point of view, even "shifts" move as sonorously as purely metrical lines and there is an unexpected lightness about them. Everything is in motion, and even when some rhythmic pattern establishes itself for a longer stretch one does not lose the feeling that anything may happen any minute and that the verse is full of other latent possibilities, any of which may be realized at any moment. It is probably the "freest" free verse in world poetry. No one in Russia tried to imitate it. Only Khlebnikov could develop it. With him it stands as a unique achievement, which is difficult to analyze and more difficult to demonstrate since the analysis of separate lines does not lead to anything concrete. Here the designation "synthetic meter" fits much better than in the earlier period, because a synthesis is achieved in which meters lose their individual characteristics without ceasing to be ingredients.

VII

Khlebnikov relatively seldom experimented with rhyme in his *poemy*, whereas in his other works, especially in short poems, he attempted all possible ways of rhyming. In *poemy* rhymes look much more conventional and do not seem to be the primary problem. This difference becomes even more striking during the Kharkov period, during which, as a strange parallel to a classical stabilization of rhyme in *poemy*, there is frantic laboratory work going on in the short poems and fragments: inexact rhyme, "slant" rhyme (*kosoe sozvuchie*), compound rhyme, etc. This is a separate current which only seldom, and in small doses, enters the world of *poemy* — a deeper, more intimate world of a man who seems a complete stranger to the author of the experimental fragments.

In his rhyme Khlebnikov combines two important trends in the development of Russian rhyme during its more recent periods. First of all, there is the tendency toward a maximum consonant identity. The identity of the so-called "supporting consonant," *i.e.*, the consonant immediately preceding the stressed vowel, becomes almost a rule, resulting in a "rich" rhyme. Here are examples from "The Tsar's Bride":

<i>medam: vozdam</i>	<i>strashen: brashen</i>	<i>udaryu: gosudaryu</i>
<i>net: tenet</i>	<i>dev: odev</i>	<i>u nikh: zhenikh</i>
<i>gordets: serdets</i>	<i>zavivaya: zhivaya</i>	<i>boyar: yar</i>

This rhyme has a natural tendency towards homonymic rhyme: *proch: poroch* *opale: upali* *dusha: dysha* *kosaya: kusaya* and occasionally becomes homonymic rhyme:

<i>k nemu: nemu</i>	<i>temi: temi</i>
---------------------	-------------------

The second important feature of Khlebnikov's rhyme is shared by him with Russian poets of the second half of the nineteenth century. At that time "unstressed vowels ceased to be felt as different" (Tomashevsky). This change is usually connected with the name of Alexey K. Tolstoy, not because he introduced the new type of rhyme or practiced it exclusively, but because he was the most articulate defender of the new, "inexact" rhyme. The main characteristic of this, let us call it "Tolstoyan," rhyme is its disregard of the vowels following the stressed vowel. Var-

ious kinds of truncated rhyme are a part of this development. It is well known that Russian Symbolists were interested in this rhyme and that A. Blok in particular worked in this direction. For this reason many of his rhymes create the impression of indefiniteness and of partial belonging to another world, which is so much in tune with his themes. In Khlebnikov both over-richness and unfinished quality suggest a primitivism in which the bright *lubok-colors* are combined with deliberate "clumsiness" of outline. Here are some "inexact" rhymes also from "The Tsar's Bride":

treshchiny: obeshchana kolymage: vлага vstrechu: veche
pyli: zaliv bleshchut: veshchi

Finally, Khlebnikov combines the "Tolstoyan" and the "rich" rhyme, thus uniting a disregard of posttonic elements with special attention to pretonic ones. In itself, there is little new about this, but no one else practiced this kind of rhyme as persistently as Khlebnikov did:

rydanyem: svidanye slushal: glushe rydanyakh: danyu
otkosa: kosy kresle: chresla stane: vstanet
chelyad: kacheli otny: otnyal

Thus two contrasting tendencies are found in one rhyme. The pretonic part seeks to become a homonym, whereas the posttonic part strives to eliminate rhyme characteristics completely. It leads to one case in "Malusha's Granddaughter" where a post-stress element in one word rhymes with a zero element in another (*staey: prosta*), thus producing a heterosyllabic rhyme.

These main tendencies are combined or go their separate ways in later poems by Khlebnikov, each of which presents its own, individual system of rhyme. Other types of rhyme appear, such as heterosyllabic, heterotonic, etc. It is interesting to note that the compound rhyme of the Mayakovsky variety was practiced by Khlebnikov in 1909 in "Malusha's Granddaughter":

Kieve: kakie vy zelen: groze len igre zim: grezim

and was later developed by him, especially in his poems about the Revolution.

The general tendency in post-revolutionary poems, however, was to treat rhyme with utmost freedom. In "The Poet," for instance, the impression is that Khlebnikov does not care about rhyming. He rhymes at random, taking whatever comes to him on the spur of the moment. Now he does not rhyme at all, now he uses triple rhyme or even what may be called "two-and-a-half" rhyming, *i.e.*, using different types of "inexact" rhyme in a conventional rhyme pattern:

vodopadom: padaya: ladoyu
bosonozhek: prokhozhikh: nozhik

There are even instances like

prodavshchits/ ovoshchey: litsa/ skripachey,

where the first word builds not only a heterosyllabic rhyme with the third one, but a consonantal rhyme with the second one as well.

In this context, one should also note individual *poemy* which aim at a maximum sound identity and extend the idea of rhyme to include "orchestration" of the whole line. Such are particularly "The Sylvan Sadness" and "Razin's Boat." In the former there is a real parade of "root alliterations," tautological structures, homonymic rhymes, "internal declension," and sometimes rhyme occupies the whole line, as in

Polevaya v pole voyu
Polevuyu voyu volyu

Both poems are literally saturated with sound. Even more so is the palindromic "Razin," which is "nothing but rhyme" (Kruchenykh).

This article has aimed only at pointing out that the key to Khlebnikov's work has to be sought in his *poemy*, and it has tried to show the importance of these *poemy* in modern Russian epic tradition, in the history of Russian primitivism, and in the development of Russian rhythm and rhyme.

One could also discuss at length the individual characteristics of these *poemy* and analyze the poetic "handwriting" of

Khlebnikov. There are many original aspects in his stylistic mixing, his imagery and his device of double-meaning. Of special interest is Khlebnikov's use of semantic "shifts" (*sdvigи*), which makes him a past master of "the wrong word" and probably the most important representative of that poetry which is based on the non-best words in the non-best order. Numerous examples of "literary echo" in his lines are also worth attention. However all this would have to be the subject of another article.

Charles Darwin and Russian Scientists*

By JAMES ALLEN ROGERS

THE magnitude of contemporary Soviet achievements in the natural sciences begins to assume more reasonable proportions when it is remembered that behind Soviet science lies the solid history of Russian science which began long before 1917. It is increasingly recognized that while Russia by Western standards may have been industrially somewhat *undeveloped* in 1917, she was not an *underdeveloped* country comparable to the former colonial possessions in Africa and Asia now making their bid for independent growth and development. Russia was more advanced in scientific knowledge before 1917 than her industrial capacity would have seemed to indicate. Tsarist Russia traditionally initiated movement from the top of the pyramid downwards and she had produced world-renowned scientists long before the bulk of her peoples had crossed the threshold of literacy.

This is nowhere more clearly seen than in the reaction of Russian scientists to the publication of Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species* in England in 1859. Members of the younger Russian intelligentsia such as Dmitri Pisarev welcomed with surprise and delight Darwin's theory of evolution which seemed in their interpretation to furnish unexpected confirmation of their materialistic philosophies.¹ The effect on Russian science was much less staggering. Wrote the Professor of Comparative Anatomy at the University of Moscow in reference to Darwin's *Origin of*

*This essay is part of a longer study on Darwinism and Russian social thought which was made possible by a grant from the Russian Research Center at Harvard.

¹See the author's, "Darwinism, Scientism, and Nihilism," *The Russian Review*, XIX, no. 1, 10-23.

Species:

This book, was not the same thing which we had heard from Rouiller, but it was something similar, so related to that which Karl Frantsevich had taught us, that the new theory seemed to us something long known, only brought into greater sharpness, of a stricter scientific form, and in particular furnished with an incomparably greater collection of factual evidence.²

Karl Frantsevich Rouiller (1814-1858) was only the last in a series of Russian scientists who had formulated theories of evolution before the publication of Darwin's work on the origin of species. Born in Nizhni Novgorod (Gorky) of a family of French shoemakers, Rouiller later received a degree from the Moscow Medical-Surgical Academy. In the summer of 1841 he went to Germany to study and upon his return in 1842 took the chair of Zoology at the University of Moscow. He was then 28 years of age.³ In 1845 Rouiller gave a series of public lectures at the University of Moscow on the habits and forms of animals. Alexander Herzen was among the admiring audience and enchanted by the style and by the content of Rouiller's talks, he wrote an article about them for the *Moskovski vedomosti*.⁴

Rouiller's views on evolution were similar to those of other pre-Darwinian students of nature in Western Europe. He believed that evolution had taken place by way of a gradual and slow development not from one but from a number of different forms. But as to the process by which evolution had taken place, Rouiller had no definite answer and his hypotheses were similar to those of the other pre-Darwinians: changes in heredity by the influence of the surrounding conditions and by the inheritance of acquired characteristics.⁵ What was to be new in Darwin's theory was the attempt to base a theory of evolution on a particular means of adaptation as Darwin succinctly explained in his title, *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*. The theory of natural selection was novel rather than the idea

²Iakov Andreevich Borzenkov, *Rech i otchet*, (Moscow, 1881), p. 42.

³B. E. Raikov, *Russkie biologi-evoliutsionisty do Darvina*, 3 vols., (Moscow, 1952-54), III, 1-186.

⁴A. I. Herzen, *Sobranie sochinenii*, 30 vols., (Moscow, 1954), II, 140-150.

⁵K. F. Rouiller, *Izbrannye biologicheskie proizvedeniya*, (Moscow, 1954).

of evolution itself which can be traced at least in a crude form back to the first millennium B.C.⁶

It is very significant that Alexander Herzen in discussing Rouiller's public lectures never mentioned the content of the lectures at all. "We beg leave," wrote Herzen towards the end of his article, "to give our opinion on his theories and views of Monsieur Rouiller in a later article."⁷ He never did. This was not the major interest of the generation which was excited by Rouiller's lectures. Instead, Herzen began his article with a declaration which was the motif of the entire essay:

One of the principal demands of our time is the circulation of authentic and useful data on natural science . . . We believe it is nearly impossible to cultivate a really strong intellectual activity without natural science. No other branch of knowledge trains the mind to advance so firmly and steadily, to submit so readily to the truth, to work conscientiously and, what is more important, to accept consciously the *consequences that follow*.⁸

The growing prestige and authority of the natural sciences only reinforced the reaction which some members of the generation of the 1840's such as Herzen felt against their earlier concern with the highly speculative and idealistic German philosophy. This new materialistic science seemed to clear the air of the dark and misty clouds of German metaphysics and to put the search for "reality" on a more meaningful basis. But Herzen was not prepared to move as far towards a totalitarian belief in science as did the later nihilists of the 1860's. He did believe, however, that the influence of German philosophy had retarded the progress of science:

Our imagination is so corrupted by and saturated with metaphysics that we have lost the ability to express in a simple and straightforward way the events of the physical world without unconsciously introducing false notions by our very modes of expression, confusing the metaphor with the thing it stands for, separating in words what is in reality joined.⁹

This was not quite fair to the influence of German philosophy on the later acceptance of Darwinism in Russia as in Europe.

⁶Henry F. Osborn, *From the Greeks to Darwin*, (London, 1902).

⁷Herzen, II, 149-150.

⁸Herzen, II, 140.

⁹*Ibid.*

In a sense, Hegelianism with its dynamic view of human history had prepared men's minds for the Darwinian view of the evolution of natural history. But it was German *naturalphilosophie* which had an even more immediate effect in preparing the Russian thinkers for the acceptance of Darwinism.

At the beginning of the reign of Nicholas I the "subversive" discipline of philosophy was silenced by the abolishment of the Chair of Philosophy at the University of Moscow in 1826. But shunted out of the lecture room, philosophy gained admittance to the University through the scientific laboratory of Mikhail Gregorevich Pavlov (1793-1840). One of the most popular professors in the University of Moscow in the 1820's and 1830's, Pavlov had as students many of Russia's later famous scientists. Also among the students of Pavlov were many of the future Russian intelligentsia: Michael Lermontov, Ivan Turgenev, Vladimir Odoevsky, the brothers Kireevsky, Michael Pogodin, and Alexander Herzen.¹⁰

Pavlov was a follower of Friedrich Schelling and Lorenzo Oken and the influence of their vague but suggestive metaphysical *naturalphilosophie* permeated his science courses as he grafted German philosophy to the tree of Russian science. Alexander Herzen wrote later in his autobiography:

Pavlov gave us an introduction to philosophy by way of physics and agricultural science. It would have been hard to learn physics at his lecture, impossible to learn agricultural science; but they were extremely profitable. Pavlov stood at the door of the section of Physics and Mathematics and stopped the student with the question: "You want to acquire knowledge of nature? But what is nature? What is knowledge?"¹¹

Another student has commented that Pavlov's course in mineralogy was so theoretical that the students never saw a single rock. His course in physics was equally vague. In the oral examination for physics at the other major Russian university, that of St. Petersburg, if a student said he had studied "according to Pavlov" he was given a zero and asked no further questions.¹²

¹⁰Raikov, II, 480-483.

¹¹Alexander Herzen, *My Past and Thought*, 6 vols., tr. by C. Garnett, (London, 1924) II, 113-114.

¹²Raikov, II, 2/ 486-487.

Pavlov's significance for the study of pre-Darwinian Russian evolutionary thought lies not in any specific theory about evolution (or transformism as it was often then called); his thought was couched in a terminology much too vague for that kind of contribution. But he popularized the idea of transformation or evolution and of the unity of all nature which had an enormous influence on later Russian scientific and social thought.

Indeed, Charles Darwin himself admitted in "An Historical Sketch" attached to his *Origin of Species* that various theories of evolution had preceded the publication of his own work. By the sixth edition of the *Origin of Species*, this list of predecessors had grown to formidable proportions and included three Russian scientists of Baltic German ancestry. Of the first of these, Christian H. Pander, Darwin wrote somewhat obliquely:

From references in Brönn's *Untersuchungen über die Entwickelungs-Gesetze* it appears that the celebrated botanist and palaeontologist Unger published, in 1852, his belief that species undergo development and modification. Dalton, likewise, in Pander and Dalton's work on Fossil Sloths, expressed, in 1821, a similar belief. Similar views have, as is well known, been maintained by Oken in his mystical *Natur-Philosophie*.¹³

Pander (1794-1865) came from Riga and studied at the University of Derptsk. From 1821 to 1831 he published fourteen issues of *Vergleichende Osteologie* with E. d'Alton.¹⁴ This intensive study of the construction of skeletons led Pander to an evolutionist point of view although it was couched largely in *naturalphilosophie* terminology. In 1826 he became a full member of the St. Petersburg Academy of Science. Because of his pioneering work in osteology and geology, Pander is usually considered the founder of paleontology in Russia.¹⁵

In 1859 Darwin sent to Count Alexander Keyserling, a Russian geologist, a personal copy of his just-published *Origin of Species* to which he later attached in his historical sketch a tribute to Keyserling:

¹³Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*, 6th ed., (New York, n. d.), p. 9.

¹⁴Published in Bonn. Each of the 14 parts consisted of an atlas of illustrations by d'Alton with text by Pander.

¹⁵Raikov, 151-239.

In 1853 a celebrated geologist, Count Keyserling (*Bulletin de la Soc. Geolog.*, 2nd Ser., tom x. p. 357), suggested that as new diseases, supposed to have been caused by some miasma, have arisen and spread over the world, so at certain periods the germs of existing species may have been chemically affected by circumambient molecules of a particular nature, and thus have given rise to new forms.¹⁶

Keyserling (1815-1891) was another scientist from the Russian Baltic of a family of German extraction who had become Russian citizens during the time of Peter I. Educated at the University of Berlin, Keyserling met most of the luminaries of his day and traveled over much of Europe. He took part in many Russian geographical expeditions and his friendship with the Minister of Finance secured for him financial backing for many of his scientific projects. Keyserling often expressed his great respect for Darwin and for Darwin's theory, but held reservations as to the final nature of the theory of evolution and preferred to look upon Darwinism as a provisional hypothesis which needed further work.¹⁷

The most direct contribution to evolutionary science by a Russian was that made by Karl Ernst von Baer (1792-1876) of whom Darwin wrote:

Von Baer, towards whom all zoologists feel so profound a respect, expressed about the year 1859 (see Prof. Rudolph Wagner, *Zoologisch-Anthropologische Untersuchungen*, 1861, s. 51) his conviction, chiefly grounded on the laws of geographical distribution, that forms now perfectly distinct have descended from a single parent-form.¹⁸

Von Baer was best known as an embryologist but he also made contributions in geography, anthropology, and ethnology. Of an Estonian landowning family of German descent who were Russian citizens, von Baer studied first at the University of Derptsk and then in Germany. In 1834 he returned from the University of Koenigsberg where he had been a member of its faculty to enter the St. Petersburg Academy of Science. His fame at the time rested largely upon a work on the history of the development of animals which established him as a pioneer

¹⁶Darwin, p. 9.

¹⁷B. E. Raikov, *Predshestvenniki Darvina v Rossii*, (Leningrad, 1956), pp. 85-93.

¹⁸Darwin, pp. 9-10.

in the study of embryology.¹⁹ At the same time, von Baer expressed his opinion that species could not be regarded as permanent and unchanging but had developed by transmission from the common original form.²⁰

But to the student of Russian Darwinism, it is not von Baer's writings on evolution which are of the greatest interest since evolutionary theories were not unknown before his time. Of more interest is the evolution of von Baer's attitude towards Darwin's theory of the origin of species. In August following the publication of Darwin's *Origin of Species*, Thomas Huxley wrote to Darwin, "I have to announce a new and great ally for you . . ." And then he proceeded to quote in French a letter which he had received from von Baer:

I have enunciated the same ideas on the transformation of types of the origin of species as Mr. Darwin. But it is only zoological geography on which I dwell. You will find in the last chapter of the treatise "Ueber Papuas und Alfuren," that I speak of it very firmly without knowing that Mr. Darwin was occupied with this subject.²¹

Darwin immediately wrote Huxley welcoming von Baer's support for the Darwinian theory of evolution and he added, "If you write to von Baer, for heaven's sake tell him that we should think one nod of approbation on our side, of the greatest value; and if he does write anything, beg him to send us a copy, for I would try and get it translated and published . . ."²²

Von Baer's attitude towards Darwinism was, however, far more complicated than would appear from this exchange of let-

¹⁹K. E. von Baer, *Istoriya razvitiya zhivotnykh*, 2 vols., (Moscow, 1952-53).

²⁰K. E. von Baer, *Reden und kleinere Aufsätze* (St. Petersburg, 1864), I, 39-74.

²¹Letter of Huxley to Darwin, August 6, 1860 in *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, ed. by Francis Darwin, 2 vols., (New York, 1896), II, 122. The treatise mentioned by von Baer was printed in the *Mem. de L'Academie Imp. des sciences de St. Petersbourg*, 1859, VIII, 270-346. Von Baer later wrote, "I must definitely comment that this article was not written under the influence of Darwin's theory. I had it with me in 1859 when I visited England, and I showed it to Huxley and Owen together with other articles . . . His [Darwin's] book was not yet in print. I became acquainted with it only on my return to St. Petersburg at the end of the year." Von Baer, *Reden*, II, 248.

²²*Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, II, 123.

ters. In 1864 he wrote that Darwin's theory must be called Darwin's hypothesis since in view of the kind of evidence upon which it was based, it was no more than that.²³ After the appearance of Darwin's *Descent of Man* in 1872 where Darwin set forth a theory of the origin of man based upon the same principles which underlay the *Origin of Species*, von Baer wrote an article specifically opposing most of the major points of Darwinism. He doubted that the theory of evolution could be carried as far as Darwin had taken it since the intermediate forms were missing which could prove the transition from one form to another. He also disagreed with Darwin's idea that the transformation of species could be explained on the principle of natural selection. Nor did von Baer believe that the accumulation of small chance variations could lead to new species and thought there was rather a tendency towards the leveling out of any new characteristics among the whole species. He declared himself an advocate of autogenetic evolution on the basis of spasmodic changes under the influence of the principle of purposefulness. This turn towards a less materialistic interpretation of evolution was also reflected in von Baer's denial of the view of Darwin and Huxley that man arose from the higher primates. While von Baer would not follow Darwinism as applied to man, he expressed his respect for Darwin and called himself *Ein Vorarbeit von Darwins Hypothese*.²⁴

The reaction of other Russian scientists to Darwin's *Origin of Species* was less critical but equally independent. The first communication about Darwin's book (printed in London in 1859) appeared in Russia in 1860 in the scientific journal formerly edited by Rouiller.²⁵ Darwin's theory was mentioned also in 1860 in the first-year class in biology of Professor S. S. Kutorga at the University of St. Petersburg, who wrote that of all the theories of the origin of species, "the theory of Darwin is undoubtedly the most logical, the most satisfying and at the same time one of the most simple. Science acquires in this theory the truth that natural selection is the powerful force in the forma-

²³K. E. von Baer, *Izbrannye raboty*, (Leningrad, 1924), p. 93.

²⁴von Baer, *Reden*, II, 235-480.

²⁵*Bull de la Soc. Nat. de Moscou*, 1860, V, 130-132.

tion of species." Kutorga added, however, that Darwin's theory did not entirely explain the phenomenon of evolution and that undoubtedly future investigation would discover other factors of great importance in evolution.²⁶

There began in the 1860's a correspondence between Darwin and Russian scientists who were interested in incorporating Darwinism into their particular branches of science. In the middle 1860's Darwin was visited by a young Russian scientist, Vladimir Onufrievich Kovalevsky, who was passionately interested in amalgamating Darwinism and paleontology.²⁷ Later in his *Descent of Man* published in 1872, Darwin twice referred to observations made by Kovalevsky in Russia. The following year Darwin wrote to Kovalevsky:

I thank you for your extremely interesting letter. Your paper in the *Proc. of the Royal Soc.* appeared to me a very valuable contribution to science; and if I had known your address, I would have written to you at the time . . . I am extremely glad to hear that you have been successful in your further researches. The dedication of which you speak will be very gratifying to me, and I look at it as a great honor.²⁸

V. O. Kovalevsky replied to Darwin apropos of the scientific monograph which applied Darwinism to paleontology:

That I am able to dedicate this treatise to you gives me great happiness not because I consider it completely worthy of such a dedication, but because this gives me an opportunity to express the profound respect which I personally feel for you. From the very beginning of my studies, you have been for me the best teacher and the best friend: to all my works you always gave full attention and created the possibility for my investigations during my protracted visit to England. Thanks to your intercession many collections and libraries were opened to me which without this perhaps would have remained

²⁶S. S. Kutorga, "Darvin i ego teoriya obrazovaniya vidov," *Biblioteka dlya chteniya* (November-December, 1861). Extracts have been reprinted in V. A. Alekseev, ed., *Darvinizm, Khrestomatiya*, (Moscow, 1951) pp. 634-637.

²⁷Charles Darwin, *The Descent of Man*, (New York, n. d.), pp. 523, 701.

²⁸Letter of Darwin to V. O. Kovalevsky, May 21, 1873 in Charles Darwin, *Izbrannye pisma*, (Moscow, 1950) pp. 232-237. From the correspondence between V. O. Kovalevsky and Darwin it appears that Darwin valued the work done in paleontology by V. O. Kovalevsky more than the contributions made by his brother, A. O. Kovalevsky, in embryology.

closed. Your name and your friendship were for me the best recommendation which opened all doors.²⁹

So close did the pursuit of science make Vladimir Kovalevsky feel to the English world of Darwin that when he received the mistaken news of Huxley's death, he immediately wrote his brother:

What sad news: Huxley is dead. Is it possible that anything could be worse than this. I almost cried upon learning this news. I understand that he left eleven children. I am writing Darwin and proposing to him that if he will organize a subscription for the family, we will try to gather something here in Russia. This is a loss not only for science, but for the intellectual side of English society as well.³⁰

But the Russian who did more to popularize Darwinism in Russia than anyone else was Kliment Arkadievich Timiryazev (1843-1920). As a young university student he had first heard of Darwin's theory of the origin of species in the first-year biology class of Professor S. S. Kutorga at the University of St. Petersburg in 1860. Four years later he wrote several articles for the *Otechestvennye zapiski* on the reception of Darwin's theory which became the basis for his later famous work on the teachings of Charles Darwin.³¹

After Timiryazev graduated from the University of St. Petersburg in 1866, he went abroad in 1868 to Heidelberg for study and research where he spent much of his time with the ardent Russian Darwinist, Vladimir Kovalevsky.³²

In 1877 Timiryazev managed, after some difficulty, to arrange an interview with Charles Darwin at his country home in England. Darwin mentioned with special pleasure that he was aware that many of the Russian youth had become warm partisans of his theory, and he gave particular importance to the work in paleontology being done by V. O. Kovalevsky. After several hours of talking of botany and of science in general, Darwin bade goodbye to Timiryazev, but then returned and added:

²⁹Letter of V. O. Kovalevsky to Darwin, August 30, 1873 in L. Sh. Davitashvili, *V. O. Kovalevsky*, (Moscow, 1946), pp. 65-66.

³⁰Letter of April, 1874, *Ibid.*, p. 228.

³¹Timiryazev's articles in no.'s 8, 10, and 12 of *Otechestvennye zapiski*, 1864 were expanded and added to other writings to form his *Charlz Darwin i ego uchenie* (Moscow, 1940).

³²G. Platonov, *Kliment Arkadyevich Timiryazev*, (Moscow, 1955), p. 20.

I returned in order to say two words to you. At this minute you will meet in this country many fools who think only of involving England in a war with Russia, but rest assured that in this house there is sympathy for your country, and every morning we pick up the paper with the desire to read news of your triumphs.³³

In 1912 Timiryazev wrote to the intermediary who had arranged the interview with the Darwin family, "Never will I forget that thanks to you I had the good fortune to see in the course, alas, of several hours, the greatest genius of all time." To which his correspondent replied, "I am able to add that you were the only man to whom I decided to give a letter to Darwin, knowing that the state of his health did not allow him to receive anyone. I have only learned all the details from you just now. But Darwin often told me after your visit what pleasure it gave him meeting and talking with you."³⁴

Timiryazev had the opportunity to express indirectly his gratitude to Darwin when there appeared in Russia in the 1880's a large work by Nicholas Danilevsky entitled *Darwinism, A Critical Investigation*. The work was strongly anti-Darwinist and reflected Danilevsky's earlier interest in attempting to develop a philosophy of history on the basis of biology and statistics. This had culminated in 1869 in *Russia and Europe*, a rather celebrated and controversial book which on the basis of historical and biological analogies pointed out the civilizing mission of the Slavs. The biological interpretations of this work hardly found support in Darwin's study of the descent of man and Danilevsky spent nearly twenty years working on his refutation of Darwinism.³⁵

When Danilevsky's work against Darwinism appeared in Russia, Darwinism was so well entrenched in the thinking of the

³³K. A. Timiryazev, *Charlz Darwin i ego uchenie* (Moscow, 1940), pp. 8-9.

³⁴*Ibid.*, p. 9.

³⁵N. Danilevsky, *Darvinizm, kriticheskoe issledovanie*, I, (St. Petersburg, 1885). Volume I is a critique of Darwin's *Origin of Species* and his *Variation of Animals And Plants Under Domestication*. Volume II of Danilevsky's work was to cover Darwin's *Descent of Man* but only one chapter, "Proizkhozhdenie cheloveka," was finished before Danilevsky died. It was published as Volume II of Danilevsky's *Darvinizm* in St. Petersburg, 1889 with a long preface by N. Strakhov.

secular intelligentsia that the book received almost no notice. The Russian Academy of Sciences considered the book for a prize and sent it for review to Count Alexander Keyserling. He reported that the results of Danilevsky's research were hardly significant for science as the book was little more than a compilation of obsolete Western anti-Darwinist criticism.³⁶

In the face of the relative indifference to Danilevsky's work on Darwinism, his friend, N. N. Strakhov, published an article which somewhat overstated the merits of Danilevsky's work at the same time that it made a frontal attack against Darwinism.³⁷ Timiryazev quickly came to the defense of Darwinism with a public lecture entitled, "Has Darwinism Been Refuted?" in which he argued that the central thesis of Darwinism, that of natural selection, had not been overthrown by Danilevsky's criticism that the mass of accidents inherent in natural selection could not have produced the order, harmony, and form of nature. On the contrary, argued Timiryazev, since the organic world is directed by iron laws of necessity, all useless or harmful organisms produced by chance are quickly eliminated by natural selection.³⁸ The polemic between Timiryazev and Strakhov continued until 1889 but was little more than a violent echo of the scientific battles which had been fought in Europe earlier over the issue of Darwinism.³⁹

The difference between the impact of the theory of Charles Darwin in Europe and Russia was that in Russia it fell on prepared soil. Unlike its reception in the West, Darwinism met almost no opposition in Russia either from the scientists or the social thinkers.⁴⁰ Timiryazev's remarkable influence in the prop-

³⁶Raikov, *Predshestvenniki*, p. 92. This is the same Count Keyserling who was praised by Darwin as a predecessor in evolutionary theory.

³⁷N. N. Strakhov, "Polnoe oproverzhenie darvinizma," *Russkii vestnik* (January, 1887).

³⁸K. A. Timiryazev, "Oprovergnut li darvinizm?" *Russkaya mysl*, (May-June, 1887). These two articles were an expansion of his speech.

³⁹The most important articles in this debate are: Strakhov, "Vsegdashnie oshibki darvinistov," *Russkii vestnik*, 1887 and Timiryazev, "Bessilnaya zloba antidarvinista," *Russkaya mysl*, 1889.

⁴⁰Following the short-lived controversy over Danilevsky's book, criticism of Darwinism after the 1880's came primarily from the supporters of the Russian Orthodox Church. See the interesting article by George L.

agation of Darwinism came not only from his prestige as a scientist (he was a pioneer in the study of photosynthesis) but also from the widespread popularity which he had won with his open espousal of liberal political views. Darwinism had already been accepted enthusiastically by the radical younger intelligentsia of the 1860's who thought that they saw in the theory of the origin of species the possibility of unifying the development of all organic life under a non-metaphysical theory which would provide a major support for their materialistic philosophies. Under the influence of Timiryazev's popular writings on Darwinism, this scientific theory soon became a part of the political creed of all those persons who considered themselves progressive in social and political thought. Wrote the brother of V. O. Kovalevsky:

Darwin's theory was received with special sympathy in Russia. Whereas in Western Europe it encountered firmly established old traditions which it had first to overcome, in Russia its appearance coincided with the awakening of our society after the Crimean War, so that it immediately acquired citizenship in the scientific as well as in the social world and ever since has enjoyed widespread popularity.⁴¹

Lacking a dynamic middle class striving for economic and political power and a secular rationalization of its success, Russia never developed the Western idea of Social Darwinism nor the later reaction against it. The result has been that the influence of Darwinism on both scientific and social thought in Russia has crystallized into categories of opinions quite distinct from those of Western Europe and America.

Kline, "Darwinism and the Russian Orthodox Church," in *Continuity and Change in Russian and Soviet Thought*, ed. by Ernest J. Simmons, (Cambridge, Mass., 1955), pp. 307-328.

⁴¹Platonov, p. 124.

Soviet Agricultural Reform and the Future of the Collective Farms

By JOSEF KALVODA

I

THE poorly working Soviet agriculture, "the Achilles' heel of Soviet Communism," has been of great concern to that country's leaders in the past. Recently, however, the Soviet Premier and the First Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party, Nikita S. Khrushchev, announced his régime's commitment to overtake the United States in a few years in the per-capita output of meat, milk, and butter. In order to increase agricultural production and to achieve a victory on the economic front (which could then be exploited for political and propaganda purposes), a reform was launched in the Soviet collective farms with the view of (a) providing incentives to the collective farm peasantry; (b) making possible the fulfillment of the Seven Year Plan by producing raw materials for light industries; (c) giving the Soviet peoples the promised consumer goods; and (d) bringing closer the ultimate objective of achieving Communism by drawing together state and cooperative property.

More specifically, the reform calls for amalgamation of collective farms; reorganization of the Machine and Tractor Stations into Repair and Technical Stations, and the transfer of machinery and technical equipment from the MTS to the collective farms; changing the system of procurement of agricultural products, the abolition of "compulsory deliveries" to the state and the introduction of one unified procurement price system; reduction of the size of private plots with the ultimate objective of abolishing them altogether; changing the system of remuneration of labor through workdays by introduction of advance

monthly payments and guaranteed cash payments without workdays, thus making possible the application of cost accounting at collective farms; and, finally, tightening Party control over the production units — alternating incentives by coercion.

All these changes point in the same direction: the collective farms have been brought closer to the state farms which, from the very beginning, had their own tractors and machinery, paid wages in cash, had one system of deliveries for their products (since all their products were assigned to the procurement agencies), and operated on the basis of cost accounting, the state being the sole owner of these production units. The reform resulted in "drawing closer together" the collective and state farm properties.

In the past, the MTS were the principal instruments through which the collective farms were established, consolidated and politically controlled. For a long time it was believed by a great number of people, both in the Soviet Union and in the West, that through the influence and activities of the MTS the collective farms would be transformed into state farms — into units of a superior type — as socialism would develop into Communism. This has been the case. The theoretical significance of the reform lies in the claim that both the state and the collective farms are socialist units, and that, through strengthening the latter, Communism will be achieved at some future time when both state and collective farm (cooperative) property will fuse into "a single mighty river of Communist property."¹

II

The Khrushchev reform in the collective farms affected not only the structure and organization of these economic and political units, but it also had profound theoretical, legal, social, and political consequences. As the Soviet authorities claim, the chief practical result of the change has been increase of productivity; socially, the correlation of class forces in the state has been affected so that the difference between the collective farm-

¹K. Ostrovityanov, "Important Step on Road to Communism," *Pravda*, March 3, 1958.

ers and factory workers has been modified; politically, the ties between the peasantry on the one hand and the collective farms on the other hand have been strengthened, and the collective farmers have been drawn closer to the administration of the country's affairs; theoretically, the reform brought about the qualitative change in the form of cooperative property, and the emergence of a "new kind of socialist property — state-and-collective-farm property"; legally, the institution of the collective farm has received a *de facto* new status, and the collective farm law and some sections of the U. S. S. R. Constitution have become obsolete.²

The need for introducing changes in and amendments to the U. S. S. R. Constitution was brought up at the 21st Party Congress; and a theoretical conference met on May 18, 1959 to discuss reports on the subject.³ The changes that have taken place and are continuing to take place in the economic foundation of the Soviet state were analyzed in V. F. Kotok's report. Included are changes occurring in the forms of socialist property, in its structure, and in the correlation of class forces in the state.⁴ As the Soviet theoreticians and jurists see it, "the state (public) and the cooperative-and-collective-farm (group) forms of property are drawing closer together," and "the direction in which they are developing and will continue to develop is toward the coalescence of the two forms of socialist property in a uniform Communist property."⁵ The characteristic of this development is the appearance of intercollective-farm enterprises, electric power plants, irrigation systems and the like, which are the property of several collective farms. Also a number of state-and-collective-farm enterprises, whose construction was financed out of both the state budget and collective farm funds, have been established.

As a consequence of the reorganization of the MTS, the col-

²G. Aksenenok, "Collective Farm Legislation and the Demands of Life," *Izvestia*, April 14, 1959.

³G. Alexandrov, "On the Development of the U. S. S. R. Constitution in the Light of the Decisions of the 21st Party Congress," *Sovetskoe gosudarstvo i pravo*, No. 9, 1959, pp. 111-116.

⁴*Ibid.*

⁵*Ibid.*

lective-farm property includes such items as tractors, combines, and other large agricultural machines belonging to the collective farms.⁶ Marxist-Leninist theoreticians interpreted this development as "drawing closer together" the state (public) and the collective (cooperative) properties. The appearance of intercollective-farm and state-and-collective-farm property, "which attests to the interweaving of public and cooperative-and-collective-farm property, signifies a sharp rise in the level of socialization of collective-farm production. This is leading to the gradual extinction of the lines separating these forms of socialist property."⁷

The view was expressed that the Soviet Constitution should reflect the existence of the new forms of property, *i.e.*, the intercollective-farm enterprises, the state-and-collective-farm property, and, eventually, the property of such public organizations as the trade unions and voluntary societies.⁸

Furthermore, according to Marxist-Leninist theoreticians, a characteristic of the socialist state "is the alliance of the working class and the collective farm peasantry." This alliance serves "the great cause of the building of a Communist society." The changes which recently took place are expected to facilitate the building of Communism, since "the process of the drawing together of state and cooperative-and-collective-farm property and the prospect of their fusion implies at the same time the orderly elimination of the essential differences between city and country."⁹ One must point out, however, that the collective farmers, despite all these developments, are not "workers" yet. None of the jurists and theoreticians has suggested the elimination or change of the first article of the U. S. S. R. Constitution reading: "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a socialist state of workers and peasants." The labor of members of agri-

⁶In view of these developments in the collective farms, the Soviet jurists see the need for updating laws governing collective farms, especially the issuing of a new Model Charter — the basic law for the production unit's activity. Cf. G. Aksenenok, *op. cit.*

⁷G. Alexandrov, *op. cit.* Similar views were expressed by K. Ostrovityanov, *op. cit.*

⁸G. Alexandrov, *op. cit.*

⁹*Ibid.*

cultural artels, unlike the labor of workers and employees that is regulated by the principles of Labor Legislation of the U. S. S. R. and the Union Republics, is regulated "by statutes adopted by these artels in accordance with the legislation governing them."¹⁰

III

The reform and the transfer of machine operators from the MTS to the collective farms brought about an increase of the number of Communists working directly on the collective farms.¹¹ While in 1953 more than 20 per cent of the collective farms had no Party organizations, toward the close of 1958 "almost all the collective farms and state farms" had "full-fledged and vigorous Party organizations."¹² The average collective farm Party organization had reportedly twenty Communists, "or almost twice as many as five years ago."¹³ The total number of Communists in the collective farm Party organizations was "more than 1,350,000."¹⁴ This force is relied upon for carrying out the tasks set forth in the Seven Year Plan.

Since the MTS reorganization, "the district link has an even greater role in the management of the collective and state farms," and the efforts to strengthen the district link "must continue." Since a number of rural districts were enlarged as a result of the amalgamation of collective farms and the reorganization of the MTS, Party staffs were reduced in some cases, with some officials being sent directly to the collective and state farms, while, at the same time, the district links were "reinforced with personnel who are better trained."¹⁵ Undoubtedly, Khrush-

¹⁰Art. 2 of the draft of the New Labor Law Principles, *Sotsialisticheskaya zakonnost*, No. 10, October, 1959.

¹¹*Partiinaya zhizn*, No. 12, June, 1958, (pp. 57-59), reported that in Ukraine the network of primary Party organizations almost doubled since the prewar year 1940, while the number of collective farm primary Party organizations had increased almost five-fold. In 1953 there were 127,000 Communists working directly on collective farms, while their number increased to 154,000 in June, 1958.

¹²See Khrushchev's Report, *Pravda*, December 16, 1958.

¹³*Ibid.*

¹⁴*Ibid.*

¹⁵*Ibid.*

chev's colleagues or the leader himself decides upon the merit and qualification of the new appointees in the district links.

Reportedly, 3,000,000 members of the Young Communist League were working in agriculture toward the end of 1958.¹⁶

IV

After one year of experience with the collective farms having their own machinery, nothing but praise for the new system was aired in the Soviet press. The better use of technology, a Soviet writer asserted, "manifested itself in a high speed of agricultural work, raising the standard of agriculture and the effort to keep machines in good condition."¹⁷ For the first time in collective farm history "all field work was completed before October 20," while tractors were much better utilized than when they had been administered by the MTS.¹⁸ "In 1958 all machines were operable to the end of the field-work season, while in 1957, before the beginning of October, almost half of the tractors were out of order."¹⁹ The monetary income of the collective farms has doubled since 1957; and the outlays for the use of the same machines paid by the collectives were 300,000 rubles less than in 1957. In 1958, wherever the collective farm itself took care of the field-work, the cost of work done on one hectare amounted to 17 rubles, while the cost of the same operation amounted to 27 rubles wherever the collective farm was served by the MTS. The purchasing of tractors and other farm machinery, moreover, "brought forth creative initiative of the collective farm masses."²⁰

Reporting on state plan fulfillment for the first half of 1959, the press announced that the agricultural plan was overfulfilled.²¹ A claim was made that the Soviet Union "has already overtaken the United States in total volume of milk and meat

¹⁶*Ibid.*

¹⁷M. Pijanich, "Usage of Technology at Collective Farms," *Voprosy ekonomiki*, No. 1, January, 1959.

¹⁸*Ibid.*

¹⁹*Ibid.*

²⁰*Ibid.*

²¹"The Report on Plan Fulfillment for First Half of 1959," *Pravda* and *Izvestia*, July 14, 1959.

produced," and that it is "near the goal in per capita output of these products."²² In the five years (1954-1958) the average annual increase in gross agricultural output amounted to 8.6 per cent.²³

"Work has improved and things are going better," said collective farm chairmen and farmers to Khrushchev when he was soliciting their opinion on the results of the MTS reorganization.²⁴ But the production results in 1959 were not so good as was expected. Only three farm products were spotlighted in Soviet propaganda in that year — cotton, milk, and butter — because of their high output. Mr. Khrushchev, in his speech at the Plenary Session of Party Central Committee held in December 1959, admitted smaller procurement of grain in 1959 than was the average in the past four years, and blamed it on "an unfavorable year." He also expressed his disappointment with the carrying out of his celebrated "virgin land policy" while stating that "the new lands are not giving us even half of what could be obtained given proper farming."²⁵

Dissatisfaction with the results for 1959 was "stated bluntly" by D. S. Polyansky, Chairman of the Russian Republic Council of Ministers.²⁶ The said spokesman expressed an opinion, shared by several other Party leaders,²⁷ that in the intercollective-farm organizations, work is not properly coordinated, and that the agricultural agencies "are doing a poor job of supervising" the intercollective farm organizations. The Party officials advocated the reorganization of the work of the Ministry of Agriculture, the reorganization of the system of collective farm management,

²²Khrushchev's Report, *Pravda*, December 16, 1958.

²³"Report by A. N. Kosygin, Vice-Chairman of the U. S. S. R. Council of Ministers and Chairman of the U. S. S. R. State Planning Committee," *Pravda*, October 28, 1959.

²⁴Khrushchev's Report, *op. cit.*, *Pravda*, December 16, 1958.

²⁵Speech by Comrade N. S. Khrushchev at Plenary Session of Party Central Committee, December 25, 1959, "We Will Make Fuller Use of Reserves for Further Advancing Agriculture," *Pravda* and *Izvestia*, December 29, 1959.

²⁶"Report by D. S. Polyansky, Chairman of the Russian Republic Council of Ministers," *Pravda* and *Izvestia*, December 23, 1959.

²⁷*Cf.* Reports by N. V. Podgorny and N. I. Belyayev, *Pravda* and *Izvestia*, December 23, 1959.

and the enhancement of the role of local Party and Soviet agencies in collective farms. Polyansky voiced the proposals of "many collective farm chairmen and local Party and Soviet officials," to establish collective farm agencies — unions — in districts, provinces and republics, elected at conferences of representatives of the collective farms, that would assume the functions of operational administration of the collective farms, consolidation of intercollective farm ties, and the organization of joint work projects. These agencies should also "pass on questions of material and technical supplies for the collective farms and lend a hand to the economically weak farms."²⁸ Khrushchev endorsed the idea, and claimed that he had proposed the establishment of collective farm unions as far back as the time when the question of reorganizing the machine and tractor stations was being discussed.²⁹ The Party resolution instructed the Presidium of the Party Central Committee to study the proposal to establish intercollective farm associations — unions — in districts, provinces and republics.³⁰

It was deemed advisable, following the example of Party organizations of industrial enterprises, to set up within collective farm Party organizations commissions for control over the fulfillment of plans, over the utilization of agricultural machinery and the mechanization of collective farm production, and for control over reducing unit costs of agricultural production. An assertion was made that "this will greatly expand public control over the work of the collective farm boards and heighten their responsibility for carrying out Party and government directives."³¹

This proposal was taken into the Party resolution, the latter attributing the shortcomings in the development of agriculture and animal husbandry to "the feeble organizational efforts made by many local Party, Soviet and agricultural agencies," which, instead of being production organizers, "confine themselves to the formal endorsement of the Party measures and to general

²⁸"Report by D. S. Polyansky . . .", *op. cit.*

²⁹Speech by N. S. Khrushchev, *op. cit.*

³⁰Resolution of Plenary Session of Party Central Committee adopted December 25, 1959, "On the Further Development of Agriculture," *Pravda* and *Izvestia*, December 27, 1959.

³¹V. Y. Akhundov, *op. cit.*

exhortation, put up with shortcomings and exercise no real influence on the state of affairs on the collective and state farms." The resolution instructed the Party and Soviet agencies to focus their efforts on the practical implementation of the Party decisions pertaining to agriculture, and charged them with the responsibility "for fulfilling the Seven Year Plan goals ahead of schedule," and for mobilization of reserves, both material and human, in order to achieve that aim. The Party and Soviet agencies were instructed to "strengthen their guidance" of the collective and state farms, and were charged "with raising their organizational and political work with the masses." It was decided to set up Party control groups on state farms to spur agricultural production.³²

The final statement of the Party meeting, called by Khrushchev the "plenary session for mobilization of the reserves of agriculture," contained a serious indictment of the farm leadership in Kazakhstan. The Party and Soviet agencies in the Kazakh Republic "failed to organize proper preparations for harvesting" and more than 30,000 combines and 11,000 reapers took no part in harvesting on the republic's collective and state farms.³³ Khrushchev reported that "as of November 1, the grain in an area of 1,618,000 hectares in the republic had not been reaped and gathered." This serious charge tells that the reform — the transfer of machinery to collective farms — did not produce all the expected and claimed results (at least in some regions of the country), since eighteen thousands of the tractors in Kazakhstan were not used in the spring sowing, and, as pointed out above, tens of thousands of machines were left idle during the harvesting time in the republic. The Party Central Committee resolution on agriculture, with all its directives, instructions, and charges, indicates that in the future more reliance will be placed upon coercion exerted by Party and Soviet

³²Cf. point 11th of the resolution extending the Party Central Committee's decree of June 26, 1959, establishing committees to supervise economic activity of the state farms' primary Party organizations. The said decree is held binding upon the state farms (not upon the collective farms). Party control groups were established in factories in June, 1959 to correct deficiencies in Soviet industry.

³³Party resolution, *op. cit.*

agencies rather than on incentives as had been the case in the recent past.

V

Khrushchev uses both the carrot and the stick — incentives and threats — while dealing with the collective farm problems. He promises higher income to peasants, if their productivity of labor will increase; and, at the same time, he threatens them that the state will not purchase their grain, if they will not produce it cheap enough. In view of the high cost of raising grain in some provinces, the state will purchase that commodity "where it is cheapest," in the future, so that some collective farms will not be able to sell their crops.³⁴

As a true follower of Lenin, Khrushchev does not fail to report successes (at least "a little one every day") in order to boost the morale of cadres. Speaking in Kishinev, Moldavia, in May, 1959, Khrushchev told his audience about the increase in the state procurement of cattle (59 per cent), milk (24 per cent) and eggs (51 per cent) in the first four months of the year, as compared with the corresponding period of 1958.³⁵ In another speech in the Ukraine he reported a 47 per cent increase of cattle and 81 per cent increase of cows between January 1, 1954 and January 1, 1959.³⁶ As a result of the long period of "extensive Communist construction," Khrushchev asserted in his speech, "people have changed," but, a few minutes later, the same dialectician decried "some people" who are now displaying "an unhealthy kulak attitude." He praised the Soviet agencies for the

³⁴Khrushchev's report, *op. cit.*, *Pravda*, December 16, 1958. The Party leader gave the figures on the cost of raising grain on the collective farms. In Western Siberia it was 37 rubles per centner (a weight of 100kg. or 220.46 lbs.), in the Ukraine it came to 43 rubles, in Kazakhstan to 53 rubles, and in North Caucasus to 37 rubles; but in Smolensk Province a centner of grain costs 172 rubles, in Kalinin Province 166 rubles and in Byelorussia 119 rubles. As he put it, "the state will buy its grain in Siberia, Kazakhstan, the Ukraine, the Volga region and the North Caucasus, where it costs less to produce it. The same holds for other agricultural commodities."

³⁵*Pravda*, May 15, 1959.

³⁶*Pravda*, May 12, 1959.

job done, and at the same time condemned "the poor organizational work of the Ministry of Agriculture down to the district inspection service."³⁷

Poor management of an agricultural institute and auxiliary farm at Krasnodar was criticized by *Izvestia*,³⁸ and "serious shortcomings in the management of Uzbekistan agriculture" were reported by *Pravda*.³⁹ "The trouble is," the party organ wrote, "that many Party and Soviet agencies have not changed their style and methods of administering agriculture since the December plenary session of the Party Central Committee and the 21st Party Congress, have not renounced noise and bombast in their work and do a poor job of disseminating the experience of advanced workers in cotton farming and animal husbandry."⁴⁰

Inefficiency of the farm leadership in Kazakhstan and the non-fulfillment of the plan in some sectors of agricultural production (especially in grain production, which was lower in 1959 than in 1958) were discussed at the Party Central Committee meeting held in Moscow on December 22-24, 1959. It seems that the Soviet Union will fall short of equaling the per capita meat production of the United States in 1960, a goal enunciated for that year "by Premier Khrushchev in early 1957 and ridiculed as unrealistic then by former Premier Georgi M. Malenkov, who was later purged."⁴¹ Tightening of Party control over collective farming, coercion instead of incentive, is the latest Party expedient for remedying the poorly working agricultural program. If the reform was understood to be an incentive — a carrot then the tightening of controls may be compared to the stick that usually follows the carrot. The future will show how well this arrangement will work.

³⁷Khrushchev did not fail to use impressive figures on the increase of grain, meat, milk, and butter procurements and purchases by the state since 1953 while delivering his speech to the Hungarian Party Congress. See "Speech by N. S. Khrushchev at Seventh Congress of Hungarian Socialist Workers Party, December 1, 1959," *Pravda* and *Izvestia*, December 2, 1959.

³⁸May 5, 1959.

³⁹May 25, 1959.

⁴⁰*Ibid.*

⁴¹Harry Schwartz, "Soviet Indicates Farming Setback," *New York Times*, December 28, 1959.

The future also has in store new administrative form for agricultural production, the reform being seemingly an intermediate step in the direction of merging the state and the collective farms. V. V. Matskevich, U. S. S. R. Minister of Agriculture, announced the continuation of the policy of organizing state farms out of economically weak collective farms, the establishment of district collective farm unions, and the introduction of new managerial forms in agricultural production at some future date. At present, the collective farms, with machinery and machine operators at their disposal, "have, in effect, adopted as their basis the form of organization of production that has proved itself on the state farms." But there are still differences between the collective and state farms in forms of management, in the system of labor payment and in the sources from which capital investments are financed.⁴²

On the state farms the workers' wages are guaranteed, but on the collective farms the element of guaranteed wages has been lacking. A new labor payment is being devised "that will be approximately the same for collective and state farms." While on the state farms the administration of production is well-defined and the director is not dependent on the collective, on the collective farms "the form of administration is more democratic. Thus one important aim of state and collective farms is to work out a new administrative form for agricultural production that will combine the well-defined and efficient administration existing on the state farms with the democratic principles of management on the collective farms." These two forms — the collective and the state farm — will be "perfected and adapted to one another," and "all the best features of both forms shall be put to use."⁴³ The approximation of collective to state farms has been brought about in the reform; and, as Matskevich's announcement suggests, the formation of a uniform administration for all agricultural production units will mean, in effect, the merger of the state and collective farms in the future.

⁴²"Speech by Comrade V. V. Matskevich, U. S. S. R. Minister of Agriculture," *Pravda*, December 26, 1959.

⁴³*Ibid.*

Book Reviews

KULSKI, W. W. *Peaceful Co-Existence: An Analysis of Soviet Foreign Policy*. Chicago, Ill., Regnery, 1959. 662 pp. \$12.50.

This is an excellent study of Soviet foreign policy both as to its theoretical foundations and actual historical development since the establishment of the Soviet State in 1917. What is distinctive about this work is the massive and well-organized compilation of references to authoritative Soviet and Communist sources on the manifold issues it discusses. There are 1419 quotations in the body of the work, covering virtually every theme in the theory and practice of international Communism, and such a compendium alone makes this volume indispensable to the student of Soviet-Communist affairs.

In the Introduction Dr. Kulski says that, as "there are histories, monographs, and countless articles dealing with particular aspects of Soviet foreign policy," his purpose in this work "is neither a history nor a monograph, but an analysis of the basic patterns, objectives, and means." (p. xvi) He proposes therefore to examine Soviet foreign policy "in toto, as it has matured since the 1917 revolution."

Accordingly, in Chapter I the author examines the Soviet theory of revolution: the nature and universality of revolution, the role of the Marxist - Leninist - Communist Party in the revolution, and the outstanding position which the Soviet Union occupies as the bastion of the World Revolution. Chapter II takes

up the question of Russian nationalism and traces its fortunes under the Soviet regime: its repudiation by Lenin the internationalist, its re-instatement by Stalin under the exigencies of the Second World War, and its present-day revival. Chapter III, an important theoretical part of the book, works out the eight residual components of the Communist faith which will not change no matter what happens: atheistic materialism, the dictatorship of the proletariat, economic determinism, proletarian internationalism, etc.

Chapter IV takes up the related questions of Communist morality, strategy and tactics; there is here a good discussion of the Communist theory of war and the Communist manipulation of words and diplomacy. The doctrine of the "two or three camps" and of the "peace zone," the subdivision of "the capitalist camp," and the place of fate of the "bourgeoisie," especially in the underdeveloped countries, all these themes are treated in Chapter V. Chapter VI deals with the related notions of peaceful co-existence and peaceful competition: their origins and history, the impact of the nuclear stalemate, and what the Communists really mean by these terms. Chapter VII divides the history of Soviet foreign policy into five periods, and in discussing its current objectives Dr. Kulski comes to the conclusion that its main thrust today is in the underdeveloped countries.

Chapters VIII, IX and X, among the most important in the book,

take up the Communist doctrines and policies relating to nationality and to underdeveloped countries, going into such topics as the theory of exploitation, building up a common front against the West, the revival of Soviet Oriental studies, the doctrine of non-alignment, the thrust in Asia, Africa and Latin America, national fronts, and Soviet policy with respect to trade, loans and technical assistance.

One theme underlies Chapters XI, XII and XIII, namely, what might be termed Soviet-Russian imperialism. There is here a detailed account of a dozen countries overrun, a score of peoples absorbed or submerged, whole cultures dispersed or Russified, innumerable treaties and pledges broken, the conflict with Yugoslavia and Poland, and the Hungarian revolt.

Chapter XIV, the final Chapter, discusses Communism as a great international movement. It shows that there are important contrasts among the diverse Communist parties throughout the world, contrasts that are pregnant with significant developments for the future. It takes up the Communist crisis of 1956 and the great debate that has been raging since the death of Stalin on revisionism and on whether there are several roads to socialism, with special reference to the Yugoslav heresy. Most important of all, it examines the character and findings of the great assembly of Communist parties in Moscow in 1957 on the occasion of the celebration of the 40th anniversary of the Russian October Revolution. The decisions and declarations of this historic conclave of international Communism (see especially pp. 555-561) are of the utmost importance for the understanding of present-

day Communist trends.

One can find in this book copious original material from Soviet and Communist sources on the official Communist viewpoint and policy on any of these fascinating and timely themes.

Among the important conclusions of Professor Kulski's impressive investigation are:

(1) That the long-term objectives of Soviet foreign policy of Communizing the world and bringing it under the subjection of the Marxist-Leninist-Communist Party of the Soviet Union have not changed. (p. xvi)

(2) "That the Soviet leaders are guided by two motivations: their fidelity to the ideological mission of spreading Communism to the limits of the globe and national devotion to their own country." (p. xvii)

(3) "That, after Stalin's death, the Soviet leaders chose the economically underdeveloped countries as the principal battlefield in their 'peaceful competition' with the West." (pp. xix, 186 ff., 572 and especially Chapter X)

(4) That the nuclear stalemate should frighten and paralyze the Soviets as much as the West. (p. xv and pp. 571-572)

(5) That so long as the nuclear stalemate obtains the practical conclusions which the Soviet leaders draw from their present position of strength are: "to avoid an all-out nuclear war . . . ; to defend, at any price, the Soviet part of the present international *status quo*; and to change, piecemeal and without an all-out war, preferably by political, economic, and ideological means, the *status quo* in the non-Communist world to the detriment of the West . . ." (p. xx)

(6) That the pragmatic, case-by-

case, day-by-day approach of the West to international events, without an over-all, long-range policy, places the West at an enormous disadvantage vis-à-vis the Communists, who always act precisely under a global, well-integrated, long-term, revolutionary concept of history. (p. xxi)

(7) That the principles of self-determination should not be one-sidedly applied to the peoples of Asia and Africa who had been or are still ruled by the West, but also to the countless peoples in the vast Soviet and Communist empires in Eastern Europe and throughout Asia. (Chapters XII and XIII)

(8) That those who believe in the eventual mellowing of Communism should always keep in mind the irreducible residue of the Communist faith, especially with respect to the inevitable triumph of Communism, with or without war, in all countries and the bounden duty of all Communists all over the world to hasten that day. (p. 555 ff., Chapter III, *passim*)

(9) That peaceful co-existence only means absence of international military hostilities "but not a truce in the ideological, political, and economic struggle" for world domination by the Communists, and that any and all non-military means (subversion, revolution, racial hatred, anti-Westernism, etc.) may and will be used by the Communists for bringing about that end. (Chapter VI and *passim*)

As a student both of the theory and practice of international Communism, I agree in general with these main conclusions. However, I entertain greater hopes than appear to Dr. Kulski that the Russian people, with a sufficiently dynamic and far-sighted Western policy, will

themselves in time repudiate the Marxist-Leninist Communism that has been imposed upon them.

Concerning the form and substance of the argument, I can say that the style leaves much to be desired. The Chapters are well organized and divided but the impression one forms, especially if one is not fairly familiar with the subject matter, is of standing before an amorphous mass. The thought appears to be chopped up; there is not the compactness, the sustained connectedness that one requires in an inwardly integral argument. The author has waded through an ocean of material and has exhibited its contents as best he could, but there is no initial master thesis to which the material is subordinate. The data appear to overwhelm the thought, rather than the thought the data. Perhaps all that can fairly be expected from an investigation into the mainsprings and development of Soviet foreign policy is to let the documents simply speak for themselves.

The extensive index is most helpful in enabling one to look up any theme in which one may be interested exhaustively in the body of the book. There are good statistical data throughout, especially in the Introduction and on pages 62, 285ff. 393ff., 442, 445, and 484. The bibliography of 138 titles is excellent, but the mere transliteration of the Russian references both in the bibliography and the notes is of no help to the reader who does not know Russian: there should be an English translation of them as well.

This is a book that should be on the active shelf of every student of Soviet-Communist affairs.

CHARLES MALIK
Hanover, New Hampshire

BRZEZINSKI, ZBIGNIEW K. *The Soviet Bloc: Unity and Conflict*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1960. 467 pp. \$7.75.

This sophisticated study of the Soviet bloc is concerned less with the internal development of the individual countries since they have come under Communist rule, than with the relations between the center and the other members of the bloc. This is a crucial problem, embracing as it does the failure of Stalin's attempt to discipline Tito, the Polish October, the Hungarian revolution and, at least peripherally, the vital issue of Sino-Soviet relations. It also involves the (for the time being, at least) theoretical question as to how the Communist leaders might eventually attempt to organize their projected world "socialist" state.

The treatment in this volume is analytical within a historical context which emphasizes four major phases of development. The first phase (1945-47) was one of adjustment in which the various Communist parties faced the task of establishing their power while attempting as far as possible to avoid provoking the non-Communist world. The theory of "people's democracy" emerged at this time as a form of camouflage which served to facilitate the formation of transitional "people's fronts" at home as well as to calm Western fears at a time when the peace treaties were still being negotiated. During the second phase (1947-53), the effort was made to overcome national differences, to consolidate Soviet control, and to impose a more or less uniform pattern of government and policy based on the Stalinist model. This phase was accompa-

ied by the purge of a number of prominent party leaders who had borne the brunt of establishing Communist rule during the preceding phase. Tito was also marked for a purge, but the exceptional circumstances under which the Communists held power in Yugoslavia permitted him to survive and eventually to flourish outside the bloc.

For a while the new system seemed to be working pretty well, but the lack of realism which characterized Stalin's relations with Tito was also reflected in the pace and imbalance of the method of industrialization which he attempted to impose in these countries. It was in the third phase (1953-56) that these strains came to a head, and the widely advertised "new course" sponsored by Malenkov was much too modest and too late to provide a solution. It took the revolutionary events in Poland and Hungary to reveal the full extent of the crisis, and it has taken the bloc a long time to evolve a more viable program of economic growth. This process may be regarded as a fourth phase (since 1956), dominated by the personalities of Khrushchev, Gomulka, and Tito, and with China for the first time exercising significant influence. During this phase a new effort has been made to find a means of reconciling national differences with the requirements of bloc unity. A new formula has been evolved, set forth in the declaration of the Communist states issued on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution, but the new stability continues to be threatened by unresolved problems. The Soviet leaders have not yet become reconciled to the degree of autonomy achieved by Poland, nor has the

latter accepted the Soviet desire to assert decisive leadership within the bloc. China, for its part, tends to go its own way. It is in an earlier stage of development and faces different domestic problems, and its policies on a number of important issues contrast strikingly with those advocated by Soviet leaders. Other members of the bloc — in particular Czechoslovakia, Eastern Germany, and Bulgaria — have not yet advanced much beyond the Stalinist pattern.

Against the background of this analysis, Professor Brzezinski devotes his concluding chapter to a discussion of the relationship between ideology and power in the Soviet efforts to hold the bloc together. The Soviet position throughout the period has evolved in a subtle fashion and multilateral party conferences have become an important instrument of Soviet influence. The author suggests that a "common political organ" may eventually be developed to provide a unity of ideology sufficiently persuasive to counteract the many national differences. Another equally important means of holding the bloc together is the policy of economic integration, which is already being vigorously pursued. Indeed, the institutions developed in working out the problems of the bloc may be regarded as a preparation for the ultimate task of organizing a worldwide system of "socialist" states.

Professor Brzezinski has written a persuasive analysis. Although one may wish to take issue with his interpretations on occasion, he has added a new dimension to our understanding of this vital aspect of Soviet foreign policy.

CYRIL E. BLACK

Princeton University

FEIS, HERBERT. *Between War and Peace: The Potsdam Conference*. Princeton, N. J., Princeton University Press, 1960. 367 pp. \$6.50.

This volume is a sequel to the same author's *Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin*, the two books forming together a history of political relations among the three allied Great Powers during the last war. Professor Feis has demonstrated the same ability as before in producing a clear and carefully balanced picture of complex negotiations and in expertly handling abundant documentation. The reader will have no difficulty in following his story of events which crowded in the background of the Conference and of the many crucial problems which were the object of the negotiation. It is regrettable that the author did not include the Soviet diplomatic documents pertaining to that period among his source-materials; however, it must be conceded their use would not have modified the main lines of his incisive analysis.

The picture that emerges from his story reveals a peculiar feature of the Potsdam Conference, namely that the negotiating process did not reflect the contemporary distribution of power between the United States and the Soviet Union. The two delegations bargained as though they represented equally mighty Powers, and Stalin got by the end of the Conference most of what he had intended to achieve. He not only appeared "to know what he wanted and how to go after it" (pp. 316-317), but he bargained with a self-assurance which stood in contrast with his knowledge that his country had been bled white and was unable to face a serious showdown with its Western Allies.

The United States never attempted to throw in the balance its own power which then was at a peak never attained before or since. Its armed forces were not yet demobilized, and the epoch-making news about the detonation of the first atomic bomb reached the President at the time of the opening of the Conference. Churchill immediately sized up the political importance of the American monopoly of the new weapon when he said, ". . . we now had something in our hands which would redress the balance with the Russians." (quoted on p. 172). Yet the author notes that this "something" had no apparent influence on the negotiating tactics of the American delegation: "Certainty that we would be able to defeat the Soviet Union in war did not cause Truman or his advisers, military or civilian, to be more demanding." (p. 179) He could not find any perceptible impact of the new weapon even on the military evaluation of the prospective Soviet participation in the Far-Eastern War: "Among the Americans were General Eisenhower and General Marshall and his colleagues on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in whose minds what counted most was the Soviet promise to join in the war against Japan and so ease and shorten that struggle." (p. 320)

The course of the Conference was politically affected by the continued American assumption, despite a growing body of evidence to the contrary, that the spirit of the Grand Alliance would survive the victory over the common enemies and would become the cornerstone of future peace. Hence there was a notable lack of understanding for the need of a close co-ordination of the American and British policies

regarding the third Ally. The President, inexperienced in foreign affairs, was not yet the statesman whom later events would reveal ". . . some of his advisers had imparted to him mistrust of the Prime Minister's motives and judgment . . ." (p. 318), while ". . . he did not always see through the dissembling mind and words" of Stalin. (p. 318)

"Churchill was depressed at the pull of the Soviet Union on Europe, and at the refusal of the American government to adopt his ideas of political and military strategy." (p. 318) This judgment, especially its second part, could safely be extended to the whole crucial period, from the Teheran Conference to the Potsdam Conference. Alone he could do little to alter the course of events.

Barely fifteen years have elapsed since the Potsdam Conference, yet these fifteen years have sufficed considerably to change the distribution of power between the United States and the Soviet Union. In 1945 Stalin had to fight his last major diplomatic battle over Eastern Europe. Today Khrushchev refuses even to talk about that part of Europe and extends his active interest to all continents, including the Western Hemisphere. He has proclaimed the Monroe Doctrine dead while implicitly enunciating his exclusive claim to events within the Soviet third of the world, as well as the right to interfere in the remainder of the globe. Such a picture of the future was probably not entertained even in Churchill's worst forebodings at the time of the Potsdam Conference.

W. W. KULSKI
Syracuse University

DONCHIN, GEORGETTE. *The Influence of French Symbolism on Russian Poetry*. s'Gravenhage, Mouton & Co., 1958. 241 pp. f. 24.

Any book on Russian Symbolism is welcome at the present time, because the real study of this important period has hardly begun. In the U. S. S. R. this movement is deliberately misinterpreted, while large segments are even ignored altogether. Outside Russia a few scholars have tackled this period (recently Hans Holthusen has done so successfully), but still what has been done is not enough.

Despite its title, the present book deals only with the influence of French Symbolists on Russian Symbolists, ignoring other Russian poets and movements. The first two chapters contain extensive material on the first contacts between literary Russia and French *fin de siècle* as well as a detailed description of the Russian Symbolist press. These chapters are on the whole good, but matters become worse with Chapter III, because the author is not consistently able to cope with the difficult theme of Symbolist esthetics. At best, she falls back on literary clichés, but, more often than not, what she states is vague, confusing, or extremely naïve. Less confusing but no less naïve is the chapter on Symbolist themes. A few sentences from this and other chapters will demonstrate this point:

"The Acmeists strove to break through the fetters of the metric system by omitting syllables" (p. 74); "Escapism forces modernists to prefer dreams to reality" (p. 126); "Futurists... paid special attention to vocabulary, morphology and syntax" (p. 118);

"Beauty, in which Sologub seeks

escapism [escape?] takes the form of nature, spirit, imagination, of death and isolation, even [?] of the cult of the body" (p. 94).

About Sologub, she writes: "there rarely was a writer more concerned with himself" (p. 132).

"The poet enlivened his dead atmosphere, his waxwork people only by his orchestration of sounds" (p. 133); "For some reason this consonant must have seemed especially attractive to the Symbolists" (p. 203).

Much data are collected to establish the French influence, and a considerable amount is valuable, but the very problem of influence is often pushed too far or oversimplified. Even the lilac color of the cover of *Novyi Put* becomes a borrowing from the French. "The symbolist interest in words undoubtedly [!] derives from Mallarmé" (p. 118). Sometimes Russian Symbolists simply and cheerfully not only "take over" (p. 97) from French literature such things as individualism but "combine it with distorted Nitzscheanism" and "perhaps with a reminiscence of Fichte's subjective idealism." The "perhaps" in the preceding sentence is not an accident. The "influence" passages are full of "it may be true," "it could be deduced," "it can be explained partly," and "might have been." Thus the erotic theme is borrowed from the French Symbolists, but it also "might have been a relic of naturalism." (p. 140) For the prevailing mystical mood among the Russian Symbolists three possible sources are offered, but at the end the author, overcome by generosity, concludes that it is "probably due to all three of them." (p. 89)

Bryusov gets more attention in

this book than any other Symbolist poet (he is also the only poet the author seems to understand), and this can partly be explained by the fact that he is the best example of French influence. The most convincing and substantial pages are those where Verhaeren's influence on Bryusov is discussed, but there is not much about Balmont or Gippius, very little about Bely, and nothing about V. Ivanov. It is true, of course, that they offer little evidence of French influence. I. Annensky could provide good material, but his name is mentioned only once. Often the author exaggerates the French influence. She states, for example, that Verhaeren "showed Bryusov that there were no themes unsuitable to poetry, that philosophical and sociological motifs could be treated by a poet." (p. 160) Surely, Bryusov did not need Verhaeren to show him that; he had many good examples in Russian poetry. Similarly, there is no need to quote Baudelaire on p. 191, because Russian poets also used the same device (see A. Fet's popular "Svezh i dushist tvoy roskoshnyi venok.") The phrase "pesnya bez slov" does not have to be a direct reminiscence of Verlaine," (p. 108) because countless Russians played Mendelssohn on their pianos for decades before that.

Bryusov also dominates the chapter on the Symbolist technique, which is the last in the book. Here the author succeeds in making several points, among them the introduction of free verse by Bryusov following the example of French *verslibrists*, (although there were instances of free verse before Bryusov, and they rather point in the German direction.) But when the author begins to quote and demon-

strate, one is astonished at her confusion regarding Russian versification. Her example of *dolniki* (p. 178) is not *douniki*, the free verse demonstrated on p. 183 is not free verse, and the line from Gippius on p. 179 which is said to be able "to fit . . . iamb" does not fit iamb at all. Even the very dubious definition of free verse as "a *dolnik* in which the number of accents varies" (p. 178) does not help to explain these errors. Moreover, the chapter contains passages like the following: "With Akhmatova and Mayakovsky [*dolniki*] acquired a different character, although basically remaining the same." (p. 171) Why Akhmatova's *dolniki* differ so much from those by Blok, Kuzmin, and Gumilev is never elucidated, nor does the author specify what she found that makes Akhmatova's *dolniki* even remotely resemble Mayakovsky's verse (moreover, Mayakovsky never wrote in *dolniki*). The term "free verse" can hardly be applied to Mayakovsky's very individual type of accented verse (p. 184).

Miss Donchin's discussion of rhyme is also confused. She obviously took from Zhirmunsky's book the terms "approximate rhyme" and "inexact rhyme." But a little later she terms the latter "assonance" (p. 209) and demonstrates this "assonance" with what can only be regarded as "approximate rhymes." (p. 209) At times, "assonance" seems to cover nearly all deviations from regular rhyme (p. 214); however, when real assonance rhymes are listed (*smerch: krest* on p. 211) they are called "irregular." Complete lack of system makes the author later introduce the term "consonance," and at the very end even the term "dissonance" makes its ap-

pearance. When homonymic rhyme is demonstrated on p. 212, one cannot find a single homonymic rhyme in the entire excerpt.

It should be noted that the author likes to use the same term now in the original, now in translation (pp. 42, 67, 68), and sometimes within the same sentence (*Vesy* and *Scales*; *tolstye zhurnaly* and "stout journals"). Although the bibliography does not claim to be complete, it nevertheless lacks several important items.

The final verdict has to be that, although Miss Donchin has supplied valuable material, especially in the first two chapters, she has not organized it properly. Some descriptive pages in her book can be used as raw material by other scholars. However, she simply does not qualify to discuss Symbolist esthetics. As to poetic technique, she should ascertain what certain terms really mean.

Perhaps Miss Donchin is not to blame. Her book could have been better if she had had at her disposal good studies of Symbolist esthetics and literary technique. She has entered unexplored territory and became lost there.

VLADIMIR MARKOV

University of California,
Los Angeles

GSOVSKI, V. and GRZYBOWSKI, K. (Eds.) *Government, Law and Courts in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe*. New York, 1959. 2 vols. 2067 pp. \$30.00.

For more than eight years the two editors of this formidable work prepared, in cooperation with a special staff, *Highlights of Current Legislation and Activities in Mid-*

Europe, a monthly published by the Library of Congress. In the *Highlights* were published, among other things, the texts of laws issued in the Soviet Union, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania and Yugoslavia, supplied with comments and footnotes. Based, in part, on the material of the *Highlights* and in cooperation with twenty-eight highly qualified experts, the two editors have now prepared and published their new collective work. In this work they do not pay attention to the legal technicalities and details, but, as they explain in the Preface, they analyze the law of the eleven countries of the Communist bloc from the point of view of "the effects of the legal system on the rights of the people." That purpose found its specific reflection in the interesting essay "From Contract to Status" (pp. 1392-1409), in which its author, Dr. K. Grzybowski, tries to apply, perhaps too freely, the ideas of Henry Maine. However, it would be simpler and more convincing to emphasize the overwhelming predominance in the Communist legal system of public law (*jus cogens*).

The surveys on the "Origin and Development of the Communist Regime in the Eleven Above-mentioned Countries" (pp. 1-460) bring to mind significant events of the post-war period with references to the corresponding legal enactments. They also characterize the methods with the aid of which the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has established its particular regime and has spread it later into ten other countries. These surveys should be very helpful to politicians, professors, and journalists and very

instructive for the governments of the so-called neutralist states and the newly independent nations.

Still more important is the analysis of the peculiarities of the Communist legal systems. Dr. V. Gsovski gives many details characterizing the absolutely dominant position of the Communist Party and the monopolization of the legislative power by the ruling body of the Party. Although all of this has become familiar to those concerned with the problems, it would have been useful, nevertheless, to increase the number of examples cited by V. Gsovski in his rich and valuable survey in order to expose the essence of the so-called "democratic centralism." Pretending to represent "the will of the working class and of all toilers," a handful of Communist leaders applies law as an instrument for realizing its political tasks and issues orders, instructions, and decrees violating the existing law and forcing the people to renounce their rights proclaimed in the Constitution. Thus, judges elected for five years resign before the expiration of their terms, candidates nominated by various social groups remove their names from the ballots, nationalist leaders do not dare to propose secession from the federation, etc. The Constitution, therefore, is not and cannot be the supreme law unless the Communist Party ceases to monopolize the right to represent the will of the nation, i.e., unless real democracy will replace "socialist democracy."

Although the surveys published in the work under review could not exhaust the subject matter, they succeed nevertheless in presenting the main characteristics of the Communist legal order. References

to Soviet jurists and Communist leaders including Lenin, Stalin, Bukharin, Steklov and a number of *dei minores*, help to understand the peculiarities of the Communist legal system and the subsidiary role of law in general as compared with the political aims and tactics of the Communist Party.

Every country under the Communist regime follows closely the Soviet legal pattern and "builds socialism" on the basis of Soviet experience. Yet the details concerning the legislation of the three Baltic states transformed into Soviet Union Republics and the seven East-European satellites of the Soviet Union are very helpful. On the basis of these details and with the aid of an excellent index at the end of Vol. II, it will be possible to prepare special surveys on "socialist legality," organization and functions of the bars, on "evidence" in judicial procedure, and so forth.

In general, this fundamental collective work edited by V. Gsovski and K. Grzybowski is a great contribution to legal science and the anti-Communist cause. Workers and peasants of the free world have to know how the labor and the land laws of the Communist legal system deprive them of their essential rights.

The editors succeeded in their task to describe "the effects of the communist system on the rights of the people." It is regrettable, however, that they did not analyze the effects of the "bureaucratism" and the "universal monopoly" established by the Soviet system and characterized by the present reviewer in his book *Communism on the Decline*. Both V. Gsovski and K. Grzybowski are familiar with the method elaborated by the late

Lev Petrazhitsky (see "Law and Morality. The Legal Philosophy of Lev Petrazhitsky," *The Russian Review*, October, 1957). With the exceptionally abundant source material at their disposal, they could show that the Communist system not only deprives the people of some essential rights but also of any feeling of moral satisfaction and material prosperity.

G. GUINS

Washington, D. C.

LAQUEUR, WALTER Z., *The Soviet Union and the Middle East*, New York, Praeger, 1959. 366 pp. \$6.00.

The author of the book under review is quite well known for his many books and articles on the Middle East and Russia. Therefore, considering that he is not a newcomer in the field of Soviet-Levantine relations, the reader is justified in expecting that his new book, *The Soviet Union and the Middle East*, should either reveal some new, important information or present a serious, penetrating analysis of the situation. Such a hope, however, rapidly begins to vanish upon reading the jacket and introduction. This new work is not a homogenous research but simply a hastily concocted collection of essays, all of which only "constitute a part of a larger project" and have little in common with each other.

The first part offers a rather too lengthy and somewhat monotonous review of opinions on the Middle East held by the Soviet journalists who collaborated in *Novyi Vostok* or *Revolutsionnyi Vostok*, well known Soviet publications of Oriental studies which appeared in the

1920's and early 1930's. Owing to the facts that in this particular period Soviet writers still enjoyed at least a relative autonomy of expression, and that the given views often reflected such various groups as the foreign service, intelligence, foreign trade, the Third International, and, finally, simply academic research in the field, Mr. Laqueur's review of all these articles presents a curiosity for a few specialized readers but nothing really convincing for a professional. Moreover, scarce references, absence of a bibliography, and the author's unexpected enthusiasm for such promoters of the Asian revolution as Pavlovich-Weltham, Dimenstein, *et alii*, all produce the impression of political pamphleteering rather than scholarly research. Apparently the author believes that since his heroes were later, in some cases posthumously, criticized by the Stalinist clique, such attacks make them more respectable in the eyes of Western readers.

The second part, "The Breakthrough," contains more data pertaining to Soviet-Middle Eastern relations and covers the period 1954-1958. The author, however, has completely forgotten such non-Arabian but still Levantine countries as Persia, Turkey, and Israel, and concentrates his entire attention on Soviet-Arabian — or, better to say, Soviet-Egyptian-Syrian relations. The titles of these chapters — "On the Eve, 1954"; "1955 — The Arms Deal"; "The Year of Suez"; "The Suez Crisis"; "Soviet Economic Trade and Aid, 1954-58"; "Communism in the Middle East, 1954-58"; "Communism and Arab Nationalism"; and "Conclusion" — furnish a general idea of contents. New facts, however, are

rare, and even such a chapter as "Soviet Cultural Policies in the Middle East" offers little data in comparison with the similar and earlier study by Ivan Spector.

The analytical and prognostic abilities of the author can be easily seen in his concluding sentences. Writing on the eve of the Lebanese civil war, of Egyptian-Jordanian conflict and the bloody Iraqi revolution, Mr. Laqueur states that the "Arab leaders, to be sure, have buried the hatchet; even Nuri-Es Saud, Nasser, and King Hussein have temporarily patched up their differences." Before the book was published Nuri was murdered, Hussein had been close to losing the throne at least three times, and Nasser had managed to come into conflict with almost all other Arab leaders. Even the Arab-Soviet friendship so carefully described by Mr. Laqueur has undergone many crises in the last years.

Recently a prominent Harvard scholar, reviewing another work compiled and edited by Mr. Laqueur, pointed to the overinflation of the book market in the field of Russian studies. Unfortunately, this latest collection of essays by Mr. Laqueur only further justifies the observation.

SERGE A. ZENKOVSKY
University of Colorado

DRUHE, DAVID N. *Soviet Russia and Indian Communism: 1917-1947 with an Epilogue Covering the Situation Today*. New York, Bookman Associates, 1959. 429 pp. \$8.50.

The Communist movement in India has been examined by several writers in recent years. Minoo R.

Masani was the pioneer in his well written, orderly, but essentially polemical study of 1954, following which John H. Kautsky's contribution in 1956 added important theoretical insights, especially with regard to comparisons with developments in China. Gene D. Overstreet and Marshall Windmiller, building on earlier research and unearthing masses of new material, published their book in 1959, giving special attention to the Communist Party of India, but stressing Communist and non-Communist — national and international — influences on the course of Indian Communism.

David Druhe's book follows as the most recent publication on the subject. Curiously enough, however, this new study does not stand on the backs of its predecessors. Here is the work of a lone-wolf scholar who actually wrote most of the book under review in the library at the University of California (Berkeley) at the same time that Overstreet and Windmiller were working on the same subject and with much the same documentation; yet they never met during the research period and apparently were unaware of each other's existence, except through the activation of scholars' antennae, alerted when highly obscure, old documents turned up "charged out" in frighteningly regular intervals.

It must be said that Mr. Druhe was most industrious in covering his subject. He read widely into the literature, including some of the Russian materials, and examined newspaper resources more extensively than any of the other authors on the same subject. However, his lack of detailed awareness of the Indian political scene has led him to give a greater weight to CPI

developments, compared with other political influences, than would seem to be warranted, particularly for the period of the 1920's and 1930's. The author, perhaps being ignorant of some of its limitations, puts too heavy a reliance on the memoirs of M. N. Roy for the early period, for example with regard to Roy's differences with Lenin in 1920 on the nationalist issue. As 65 pages of notes attest, however, diligence and persistence were not absent in the research plan of the author.

Compared with the other available major works on the same theme, Druhe's book is less analytical and more strictly chronological than Overstreet-Windmiller or Kautsky, and is less polemical — in the utilitarian-political sense — than Masani. At the same time, Mr. Druhe has opened up facts and interpretations at every stage from the 1920's to the present that certainly must be considered by the next analytical historian of Communism in India.

There are numerous small factual errors, misprints, and faulty interpretations. For example: Evelyn Roy was not in Germany in 1929 (p. 121), but had returned to the United States; it is not Pratep (p. 20), but Pratap; *India in Transition* was published in 1921, not 1922; his treatment of Roy's mission to China in 1927 is left largely unanalyzed. (The China confusion will be clarified with the projected publication of an edited edition of Roy's *Kitaiskaya revoliutsiya i Kommunisticheskii internatsional; sbornik statei i materialov* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1929) that has been discovered in the University of Calif-

fornia (Berkeley) and Hoover libraries.)

RICHARD L. PARK
The University of Michigan

ZENKOVSKY, SERGE A. *Pan-Turkism and Islam in Russia*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1960. 345 pp. \$6.75.

This recent publication of the Harvard Russian Research Center provides a much-needed comprehensive account of the cultural identity and recent history of a number of nationalities that by the double common denominators of religion and ethno-linguistic ties comprise Russia's largest non-Slavic minority. After the customary introductory information of geographic, demographic, linguistic, historical, and economic nature the reader is given a brief history of the religious and cultural awakening among a few intellectual Muslims of Russia in the latter part of the nineteenth century. The spirit of Islamic revival and reform, born of a sense of indignation at the cultural backwardness of Muslim peoples and the spectacle of their impotence in the face of European exploitation, but coupled with an envious admiration of European education, manifested itself among Russia's Muslim subjects in much the same manner as among nineteenth century Arabs, Persians, Turks, and Indian Muslims. A handful of intellectuals with strong cultural and religious motivations and vague political consciousness were responsible for this awakening.

The first stirrings of a political nature among the Muslims of Russia came in the wake of the 1905 Revolution. These were no more

than a reflection of the Russian political movements. Thus we find the Muslim 'Ittifak' corresponding to and cooperating with the Kadets in the First and the Second Duma. A closer scrutiny of the various members of the large Turkic family of nations in Russia reveals, however, a high degree of heterogeneity in levels of culture, language, religious orientation, social stratifications, and economic interests. The Crimean as well as the Volga-Ural Tatars were the group most exposed to Russian cultural influences. They represented the front rank of the Turkic Muslims of Russia. The nomadic Kazakh, conditioned by their great distance and isolation from their kinsmen, and owing a nominal allegiance to Islam, were equally resentful of the patronizing Tatars and the expropriating Russian colonists. The handful of young Uzbek liberals were more concerned with their grim struggle against the stronghold of Muslim zealotry and reaction in Bukhara than with any scheme of pan-Turkist nationalism. The nascent nationalist elements in Azerbaijan lent all their energy to breaking the bonds of their cultural tutelage to Persia.

It was this pattern of isolation, particularism, and individualism, as well as the overwhelming power of the Russian state, that doomed the realization of the pan-Turkic ideal to a stillbirth. Nor was the ideal viable in its conception. Despite a period of fermentation from 1907 to the outbreak of the First World War, when Constantinople was host to a number of self-exiled pan-Turkists from Russia, pan-Turkism accomplished little more than fabricate an historical identity for the Kemalist movement of the follow-

ing decade. Among Russia's more advanced Turkic population it often led to a jealous reaction of Tatarism. The events of the First World War served to galvanize political and national activities of Russia's Muslim minorities. With the advent of the Provisional Government in February 1917, a number of half-prepared national, liberal, autonomy-seeking nuclei of local power sprang up among the various nationalities of the empire. Approximately the final third of Mr. Zenkovsky's book deals with the abortive struggles of each of the Turkic nationalities to establish a nationalist republic and lead an independent existence — only to bow in the end to the superior strength and organization of the Soviets. The Bolshevik policy of autonomous, but not separatist, nationalities emerges with inexorable deviousness and force. The reader may well ponder whether Stalin as the mastermind and chief executor of this policy was not also using it — as early as 1918 — as a lever in the power struggle against Trotsky and his fellow "internationalist" Communists. Most of the facts in the final chapters are available to the English-speaking reader in fuller detail in Firuz Kazemzadeh, *The Struggle for Transcaucasia, 1917-1921* (London and New York, 1951) and Richard Pipes, *The Formation of the Soviet Union* (Cambridge, 1954). But their inclusion in the present work is fully justified, for Mr. Zenkovsky's orientation and concern are totally different and require perspective and focus of his own.

A balanced and cogent conclusion raises a number of questions not only of historical but of topical interest. 1. There is no doubt that

Islamic revivalism engendered the national awakening of the Turkic people of Russia. But this national feeling soon turned matricide. A growing spirit of secularism along with vehement nationalism triumphed over religious considerations in the majority of the crucial tests. What may appear as a paradox, however, must be noted: the idea of secular nationalism found currency only among a "yeast" group of middle class intelligentsia; when there was need for mass support the national cause had to be couched in religious terms. 2. Pan-Turkism could not and did not appeal to a sufficient number of Russian Turks, nor did it assume at any time the proportions of a true movement. 3. Mr. Zenkovsky's observations on interactions of Islam and Communism are not new but they take a more meaningful and compelling aspect as they add evidence of historical facts to theoretical considerations of comparative ideology. If any conclusions can be drawn from the experience of Russia's Muslims with Communism, they may well be, (a) that among less developed and oppressed peoples a small "class" of intelligentsia may fulfill the initial phase of the role that orthodox Marxist theory assigns to the industrial proletariat, and, (b) that the faith and fanaticism of Russia's Muslims offered little more than nuisance resistance to overwhelming Soviet power. 4. Forty years of Soviet rule may not have erased all the traces of local nationalism, but in the light of Soviet power all questions of nationalism and separatism in our time assume a purely speculative form.

A final note of commendation must be made of Mr. Zenkovsky's judicious use of a vast body of

sources most of which, necessarily, is of a tendentious and biased nature. The author's personal acquaintance with some veterans of the Turkic national movements in exile adds a measure of insight and a tone of sympathy to his scholarly treatment of the subject.

AMIN BANANI

Reed College

Mostv [Bridges]. Vol. 2. Munich, ZOPE, 1959. 462 pp.

The first volume of this handsome and very substantial almanac was published in 1958 and was astonishingly successful in its ambitious endeavor to build an intellectual bridge, if fragile by definition, across the gulf which separates more than physically, the two branches of the Russian intelligentsia, the one at home and the one in exile. The second volume is, perhaps, even more successful be it alone because it lives up to the standards established in the first. It opens with seven superb poems by Boris Pasternak, dated 1958 and 1959, heretofore unpublished. The prose selection is introduced by a longish rural *povest*, *Dobrosetsy*, by A. Kulakovsky. It is interesting and "deviationist" enough without, however, being brilliant. Kulakovsky writes, let us say, on the Ovechkin-Dudintsev level without quite reaching that of Nagibin. This work invited wrath on the head of this Byelorussian writer. Whether this *per se* is enough reason to give such fiction *du côté de chez nous* the most prominent place in as meaty a collection as this volume of *Mostv* happens to be is, perhaps, a justifiable, if somewhat purist, question. Nor do I see much point

in publishing separate chapters of Vladimir Yurasov's unfinished novel *Strakh*. As to poetry, they are all there: Ivan Elagin and Olga Anstey; Klenovsky and Trubetskoi.

"Live" literature is followed by a section of literary and aesthetic criticism with three out of six essays still, of course, being Pasterнакiana. These three contributions are by V. Frank, M. Koryakov, and S. Levitsky. Koryakov's essay seems by far the most valuable to me. It is unpretentious and moving precisely because it is no more than marginal remarks as the title indicates but no less than those jotted down by a perceptive and attentive reader who knows how to read rather than philosophize with or against the author. Koryakov's interpretation of the controversial coincidences in *Dr. Zhivago* as the very foundation of the novel's structure can only be welcomed.

The third section of the almanac is dedicated to politics and culture and justifies best of all the title of the publication. I must also confess that I was delighted with the hilarious parodies, an almost entirely lost art in our grimly earnest intellectual émigré atmosphere, by a witty person who signs himself enigmatically as "Yub," in the tiny fourth section on humor. The volume is concluded by recollections and one document is well-worth mentioning right now. It is a letter to the editors by an ex-Soviet young engineer, E. Tanin, discussing with passion and insight the generic reasons of recent defection of certain strata of the young Soviet intelligentsia.

It is obviously futile to attempt further to do justice to everything the volume includes. Suffice it to sincerely recommend the entire vol-

ume to a most heterogenous group of readers.

The famous anonymous critique of socialist realism, which first appeared last year in *Esprit*, towers in significance in that portion of this volume of *Mosty* which deals with ideas. It has been credibly "retranslated" into Russian . . . and, yet, that in itself is tantalizingly uncomfortable. How did he really say it, this courageous man and/or this cowardly *malgré soi*, hiding behind anonymity? Perhaps, the authentic text could have revealed his identity and his age. This could have closed the debate as to whether he wrote "straight" or through spasms of "underground" contortions or, simply, with tongue in cheek taking us all for a ride. Since I am inclined to read that famous essay as a bitter pamphlet of despair, surcharged with dead-end disillusionment, I find G. A. Andreev's argument or rather attack on the anonymous author, which immediately follows this remarkable document, somewhat unwarranted. The curious thing is that Andreev does not seem to be too happy about his own impulse to hurl accusations against this mysterious someone either. It would seem to me that one should try to respond as best one can first of all to the twisted, bitter irony in this Kafkaesque piece, the angry mirror-writing, for instance, in the apocalyptic invocation that it would have been better to immortalize Stalin as a lasting deity and to have officially proclaimed to the plebs "that he didn't die but ascended to heaven from whence he gazes at us, taciturn, with his mystical moustache." But to demand, as Andreev does, of this anonymous intellectual Soviet product a self-lacerating *mea culpa* Christian humility seems

wrong and somehow unnecessarily punitive. And it isn't that Andreev's impulse, in turn, cannot be viewed with the greatest of sympathies. For to attempt to understand the young Soviet intelligentsia is one thing; to break the all-forgiving bread with them without any question and reservation is quite another. But just the same, Andreev's anger is less than objective. What I am trying to say here is, perhaps, less illogical than it seems. And if *Mosty* leads us to those issues which may well be unbridgeable, its self-assigned task becomes only more significant. In this sense, the two Toynbee arti-

cles on Russia: the potentate's extraordinary and highly debatable "outside"-ishness in approaching crucial problems of Russian culture and Andreev's reply to them form that other highlight in the collection.

By mentioning the personal and somehow deeply moving tone of N. A. Tsurikov's interesting recollections of his encounters with L. Tolstoy, one thus can conclude this highly inadequate coverage of *Mosty*, 2, at least on a serene note.

VERA SANDOMIRSKY
Wayne State University

Contributors To This Issue

ARTICLES

WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN, Foreign Correspondent in Soviet Russia for the *Christian Science Monitor*, 1922-1933, is the author of well-known works on the Soviet Union and international affairs.

RICHARD PIPES is Professor of History at Harvard University and is the author of *The Formation of the Soviet Union*, and *Karamzin's Memoir on Ancient and Modern Russia*.

VLADIMIR MARKOV, Russian poet and critic, has edited an anthology of poetry behind the Iron Curtain (*The Silenced Voices*, 1952) and has contributed to American and Russian émigré publications. He is at present Assistant Professor of Slavic Languages and Literatures at the University of California, Los Angeles.

JAMES ALLEN ROGERS received his Ph.D. degree from Harvard, after which he became a Fellow at the Russian Research Center there; at present he is Assistant Professor of History and Humanities at Claremont Men's College, Claremont, California.

JOSEF KALVODA received his Ph.D. from Columbia University and is at present Assistant Professor of Political Science at St. Joseph College, West Hartford, Connecticut. He is the author of articles and monographs on topics related to the Soviet Union, Central Europe, and international relations.

BOOK REVIEWS

CHARLES MALIK, former President of the United Nations General Assembly; Visiting Professor at Dartmouth College in the Spring of 1960.

CYRIL E. BLACK, Professor of History, Princeton University.

W. W. KULSKI, Professor of International Relations, Syracuse University.

GEORGE GUINS, Russian Division, The Voice of America, Washington, D. C.

SERGE A. ZENKOVSKY, Associate Professor of Russian History, University of Colorado.

RICHARD L. PARK, Department of Political Science, University of Michigan.

AMIN BANANI, Assistant Professor of Humanities and Islamic History, Reed College.

VLADIMIR MARKOV, Assistant Professor of Slavic Languages and Literatures, University of California, Los Angeles.

VERA SANDOMIRSKY, Assistant Professor of Slavic and Eastern Languages at Wayne State University.

Index to Volume 19

(JANUARY-OCTOBER 1960)

(Reviews are entered under the author of the book and under the reviewer)

	No.	Page
Adamovitch, George: Tolstoy as an Artist	2	140
Alef, Gustave: D. Tschizewskij's <i>Das heilige Russland: Russische Geistesgeschichte, I: 10-17 Jahrhundert</i>	3	295
Anderson, M. S.: <i>Britain's Discovery of Russia, 1553-1815</i> . Rev. by Andrew Lossky	1	78
Armstrong, John A.: <i>The Soviet Bureaucratic Elite — A Case Study of Ukrainian Apparatus</i> . Rev. by John Hodgson	1	81
Avtorkhanov, Abdurakhman: <i>Stalin and the Soviet Communist Party; a Study in the Technology of Power</i> . Rev. by Robert A. Feldmesser	2	212
Backus, Oswald P.: George Vernadsky's <i>Russia at the Dawn of the Modern Age</i>	3	289
Banani, Amin: Serge A. Zenkovsky's <i>Pan-Turkism and Islam in Russia</i>	4	408
Bauer, Raymond, Alex Inkeles, <i>et alii</i> : <i>The Soviet System. Daily Life in a Totalitarian Society</i> . Rev. by Warren B. Walsh	2	214
Biely, Andrei: <i>St. Petersburg</i> . Trans. by John Cournos. Rev. by Basil Petrov	1	88
Bill, Valentine T.: <i>The Forgotten Class. The Russian Bourgeoisie from the Earliest Beginnings to 1900</i> . Rev. by Dimitri von Mohrenshildt	1	80
—Peter Yershov's (Ed.) <i>Letters of Gorky and Andreev, 1899-1912</i>	1	86
Billington, James H.: Avraham Yarmolinsky's <i>Road to Revolution</i>	2	205
Black, Cyril E.: Zbigniew K. Brzezinski's <i>The Soviet Bloc: Unity and Conflict</i>	4	399
Book Notices	1	90
Book Notices	3	298
Brzezinski, Zbigniew K.: <i>The Soviet Bloc: Unity and Conflict</i> . Rev. by Cyril E. Black	4	399
Carr, Edward H.: <i>Socialism in One Country. Part II</i> . Rev. by William Henry Chamberlin	3	286
Chamberlin, William Henry: M. M. Karpovich (1888-1959)	1	72
—Old Struggle; New Tactics	1	3
—Russia Between East and West	4	309
—Edward H. Carr's <i>Socialism in One Country, Part II</i>	3	286
Conroy, Hilary: George A. Lensen's <i>The Russian Push Toward Japan; Russo-Japanese Relations, 1697-1875</i>	2	211

Cournos, John (Translator): Andrei Biely's <i>St. Petersburg</i> . Rev. by Basil Petrov	1	88
Darwin, Charles and Russian Scientists. James Allen Rogers	4	371
Darwinism, Scientism, and Nihilism. James Allen Rogers	1	10
Deriabin, Peter and Frank Gibney: <i>The Secret World</i> : Rev. by Oliver J. Fredericksen	3	290
Deutscher, Isaac: <i>The Prophet Unarmed, Trotsky: 1921-1929</i> . Rev. by Adam B. Ulam	3	287
Dobujinsky, M. V.—Pictorial Poet of St. Petersburg. Vera Kovarsky	1	24
Druhe, David N.: <i>Soviet Russia and Indian Communism: 1917-1947</i> . Rev. by Richard L. Park	4	407
Dziewanowski, M. K.: <i>The Communist Party of Poland</i> . Rev. by Jan S. Prybyla	1	82
Economy of Northern Siberia, 1959-1965, The. Constantine G. Krypton	1	47
Epstein, Fritz T.: Robert M. Slusser's and Jan F. Triska's <i>A Calendar of Soviet Treaties, 1917-1957</i>	3	296
Feis, Herbert: <i>Between War and Peace: The Potsdam Confer- ence</i> . Rev. by W. W. Kulski	4	400
Feldmesser, Robert A.: Abdurakhman Avtorkhanov's <i>Stalin and Soviet Communist Party; a study in the Technology of Power</i>	2	212
Ferguson, Alan D.: Nicholas Riasanovsky's <i>Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia, 1825-1855</i>	2	209
Fisher, Ralph T., Jr.: Donald W. Treadgold's <i>Twentieth Cen- tury Russia</i>	1	77
Fredericksen, Oliver J.: Peter Deriabin's and Frank Gibney's <i>The Secret World</i>	3	290
—Nikolai Khokhlov's <i>In the Name of Conscience</i>	3	290
—Unto Parvilahti's <i>Beria's Gardens</i>	3	290
Fueloep-Miller, René: Tolstoy the Apostolic Crusader	2	99
Gandhi, Tolstoy and. Janko Lavrin	2	132
Gibney, Frank and Peter Deriabin: <i>The Secret World</i> . Rev. by Oliver J. Fredericksen	3	290
Great Tradition in Russian Philosophy, The. Heinrich Stammler	3	254
Grzybowski, K. and W. Gsovski(Eds.): <i>Government, Law and Courts in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe</i> (2 Vols.) Rev. by G. Guins	4	404
Guins, G.: K. Grzybowski's and W. Gsovski's (Eds.) <i>Gov- ernment, Law and Courts in the Soviet Union and East- ern Europe</i> (2 vols.)	4	404
Gupta, Nolini Kanta: Boris Pasternak, An Indian Viewpoint	3	248
Hare, Richard: <i>Portraits of Russian Personalities: Between Re- form and Revolution</i> . Rev. by Hans Kohn	2	210
Hodgson, John: John A. Armstrong's <i>The Soviet Bureaucratic Elite — A Case Study of Ukrainian Apparatus</i>	1	81

Inkeles, Alex, Raymond Bauer, <i>et alii</i> : <i>The Soviet System. Daily Life in a Totalitarian Society</i> . Rev. by Warren B. Walsh	2	214
Kalvoda, Josef: Soviet Agricultural Reform and the Future of the Collective Farms	4	384
Kamo — The Legendary Old Bolshevik of the Caucasus. David Shub	3	227
Karpovich, M. M. (1888-1959). Philip E. Moseley, Martin E. Malia, William Henry Chamberlin, and Dimitri von Mohrenschmidt	1	56
Kayden, Eugene M. (Translator): <i>Poems by Boris Pasternak</i> . Rev. by Vladimir Markov	1	84
Khokhlov, Nikolai: <i>In the Name of Conscience</i> . Rev. by Oliver J. Frederickson	3	290
Khlebnikov's Longer Poems, The Literary Importance of. Vladimir Markov	4	338
Kohn, Hans: Richard Hare's <i>Portraits of Russian Personalities: Between Reform and Revolution</i>	2	210
Kovarsky, Vera: M. V. Dobujinsky — Pictorial Poet of St. Petersburg	1	24
Krypton, Constantine G.: The Economy of Northern Siberia, 1959-1965	1	47
Kulski, W. W.: Soviet Diplomatic Techniques	3	217
—Herbert Feis' <i>Between War and Peace: The Potsdam Conference</i>	4	400
— <i>Peaceful Co-Existence</i> . Rev. by Charles Malik	4	396
Laqueur, Walter Z.: <i>The Soviet Union and the Middle East</i> . Rev. by Serge Zenkovsky	4	406
Lavrin, Janko: Tolstoy and Gandhi	2	132
Lensen, George A.: <i>The Russian Push Toward Japan; Russo-Japanese Relations, 1697-1875</i> . Rev. by Hilary Conroy	2	211
Lossky, Andrew: M. S. Anderson's Britain's Discovery of Russia, 1553-1815	1	78
Malia, Martin E.: M. M. Karpovich (1888-1959)	1	62
Malik, Charles: W. W. Kulski's <i>Peaceful Co-Existence</i>	4	400
Markov, Vladimir: The Literary Importance of Khlebnikov's Longer Poems	4	338
—Eugene M. Kayden's translation of <i>Poems by Boris Pasternak</i>	1	84
Moseley, Phillip E.: M. M. Karpovich (1888-1959)	1	56
Mosty [Bridges], Vol. II, 1959. Rev. by Vera Sandomirsky	4	410
“Nationality” in the State Ideology During the Reign of Nicholas I. Nicholas Riasanovsky	1	38
<i>Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia, 1825-1855</i> , by Nicholas Riasanovsky. Rev. by Alan D. Ferguson	2	209
Old Struggle; New Tactics. William Henry Chamberlin	1	3
Page, Stanley: <i>The Formation of the Baltic States</i> . Rev. by Joseph S. Roucek	3	294
Park, Richard L.: David N. Druhe's <i>Soviet Russia and Indian Communism: 1917-1947</i>	4	407

Parvilahti, Unto: <i>Beria's Gardens</i> . Rev. by Oliver J. Frederick- sen	3	290
Pasternak, Boris, An Indian Viewpoint. Nolini Kanta Gupta	3	248
<i>Pasternak, Boris, Poems by</i> . Trans. by Eugene M. Kayden. Rev. by Vladimir Markov	1	84
Pasternak, Leonid: My Meetings with Tolstoy	2	122
Petrov, Basil: Andrei Biely's <i>St. Petersburg</i> , Trans. by John Cournos	1	88
Pipes, Richard. Russian Marxism and Its Populist Background —Translation and Analysis of Karamzin's <i>Memoir on Ancient and Modern Russia</i> . Rev. by Donald W. Treadgold	4	316
Prybyla, Jan: M. K. Dziewanowski's <i>The Communist Party of Poland</i>	2	207
—Joseph Rothschild's <i>The Communist Party of Bulgaria</i>	1	82
Publications Received	3	293
3	306	
Riasanovsky, Nicholas: "Nationality" in the State Ideology During the Reign of Nicholas I	1	38
— <i>Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia, 1825-1855</i> . Rev. by Alan D. Ferguson	2	209
Rogers, James Allen. Charles Darwin and Russian Scientists —Darwinism, Scientism, and Nihilism	4	371
1	10	
Rothschild, Joseph: <i>The Communist Party of Bulgaria</i> . Rev. by Jan S. Prybyla	3	293
Roucek, Joseph S.: Stanley Page's <i>The Formation of the Baltic States</i>	3	294
Russia Between East and West. William Henry Chamberlin	4	309
Russian Marxism and Its Populist Background. Richard Pipes	4	316
Sandomirsky, Vera: Nikolai Alekseevich Zabolotsky	3	254
— <i>Mosty</i> [Bridges], Vol. II, 1959	4	410
Shub, David: Kamo — The Legendary Old Bolshevik of the Caucasus	3	227
Slonim, Marc: Four Western Writers on Tolstoy	2	187
Slusser, Robert M. and Jan F. Triska: <i>A Calendar of Soviet Treaties, 1917-1957</i> . Rev. by Fritz T. Epstein	3	296
Soviet Agricultural Reform and the Future of the Collective Farms. Josef Kalvoda	4	384
Soviet Diplomatic Techniques. W. W. Kulski	3	217
Soviet Science, Some Judgments of. Warren B. Walsh	3	277
<i>Stalin and the Soviet Communist Party: A Study in the Tech- nology of Power</i> . by Abdurakhman Avtorkhanov. Rev. by Robert A. Feldmesser	2	212
Stammler, Heinrich: The Great Tradition in Russian Philos- ophy	3	254
Stepun, Fedor: The Religious Tragedy of Tolstoy	2	157
Struve, Gleb: Tolstoy in Soviet Criticism	2	171
Timoshenko, Stephen P.: <i>Engineering Education in Russia</i> . Rev. by Alexis R. Wiren	1	88
Tolstoy, Alexandra: Tolstoy and the Russian Peasant	2	150
Tolstoy and Gandhi. Janko Lavrin	2	132

Tolstoy and the Russian Peasant. Alexandra Tolstoy	2	150
Tolstoy as an Artist. George Adamovitch	2	140
Tolstoy, Four Western Writers on. Marc Slonim	2	187
Tolstoy in Soviet Criticism. Gleb Struve	2	171
Tolstoy, My Meetings with. Leonid Pasternak	2	122
Tolstoy the Apostolic Crusader. René Fuelop-Miller	2	99
Tolstoy, The Religious Tragedy of. Fedor Stepun	2	157
Treadgold, Donald W.: <i>Twentieth Century Russia</i> . Rev. by Ralph T. Fisher	1	77
—Richard Pipes' (Translation and Analysis) <i>Karamzin's Memoir on Ancient and Modern Russia</i>	2	207
Triska, Jan F. and Robert M. Slusser; <i>A Calendar of Soviet Treaties, 1917-1957</i> . Rev. by Fritz T. Epstein	3	296
Tschizewskij, D.: <i>Das heilige Russland: Russische Geistesge- schichte, I: 10-17 Jahrhundert</i> . Rev. by Gustave Alef	3	295
Ulam, Adam B.: Isaac Deutscher's <i>The Prophet Unarmed, Trotsky, 1921-1929</i>	3	287
Vernadsky, George: <i>Russia at the Dawn of the Modern Age</i> . Rev. by Oswald P. Backus	3	289
von Mohrenschildt, Dimitri: M. M. Karpovich (1888-1959)....	1	74
—Valentine T. Bill's <i>The Forgotten Class. The Russian Bour- geoisie from the Earliest Beginnings to 1900</i>	1	80
Walsh, Warren B.: Some Judgments of Soviet Science	3	277
—Alex Inkeles', Raymond Bauer's <i>et alii. The Soviet System. Daily Life in a Totalitarian Society</i>	2	214
Wiren, Alexis: Stephen P. Timoshenko's <i>Engineering Educa- tion in Russia</i>	1	88
Yarmolinsky, Avrahm: <i>Road to Revolution</i> . Rev. by James H. Billington	2	205
Yershov, Peter (Ed.): <i>Letters of Gorky and Andreev, 1899- 1912</i> . Rev. by Valentine T. Bill	1	86
Zabolotsky, Nikolai Alekseevich, Vera Sandomirsky	3	267
Zenkovsky, Serge: Walter Z. Laqueur's <i>The Soviet Union and the Middle East</i>	4	406
— <i>Pan-Turkism and Islam in Russia</i> . Rev. by Amin Banani....	4	408

Publications Received

ADAMOVICH, G. *Vasili Alekseevich Maklakov*. Paris, pub. by Friends of Maklakov, 1959. 261 pp. \$3.50.

ALLEN, ROBERT. *Soviet Economic Warfare*. Washington, D. C., Public Affairs Press, 1960. 293 pp. \$5.00.

—. *Soviet Influence in Latin America*. Washington, D. C., Public Affairs Press, 1959. 108 pp.

BEREDAY, G., BRICKMON, W., READ, G. (Eds.) *The Changing Soviet School*. Boston, Mass., Houghton Mifflin, 1960. 514 pp. \$6.50.

BORYS, JURIJ. *The Russian Communist Party and the Sovietization of Ukraine*. Stockholm, 1960. 374 pp.

Cahiers du Monde Russe et Soviétique. I. Paris, Sorbonne, 1959. 198 pp.

CONQUEST, R. *The Soviet Deportation of Nationalities*. N. Y., St. Martin's Press, 1960. 203 pp. \$6.75.

DANIELS, ROBERT. *The Conscience of the Revolution. Communist Opposition in Soviet Russia*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1960. 524 pp. \$10.00.

DE GRUNWALD, C. *Saints of Russia*. N. Y., Macmillan, 1960. 180 pp. \$3.50.

DOVRING, K. *Road of Propaganda. The Semantics of Biased Communists*. N. Y., Philosophical Library, 1959. 158 pp. \$4.75.

GARTHOFF, R. *The Soviet Image of Future War*. Washington, D. C., Public Affairs Press, 1959. 137 pp. \$3.25.

GONCHAROV, IVAN. *Obломов*. Trans. by N. Duddington. Intr. by R. Poggiali. N. Y., Dutton, 1960. 517 pp. \$1.85.

GREY, IAN. *Peter the Great*. Philadelphia, Pa., Lippincott, 1960. 505 pp. \$7.50.

HAZARD, JOHN. *Settling Disputes in Soviet Society*. N. Y., Columbia University Press, 1960. 534 pp. \$9.50.

—. *The Soviet System of Government*. Rev. Edition. Chicago, Ill., The University of Chicago Press, 1960. 262 pp. \$4.00.

HINGLEY, R. (Ed.) *Modern Russian Reader. Soviet Prose*. N. Y. Mentor. 320 pp. \$1.45.

ISWOLSKY, HELENE. *Christ in Russia*. Milwaukee, Wis., The Bruce Publishing Co., 1960. 213 pp. \$3.95.

Kniga o Russkom Evreistve [Book on the Russian Jewery]. N. Y., Assn. of Russian Jews, 1960. Distributor, J. Lounz, N. Y. 591 pp. \$3.50.

KODRIANSKAYA, N. *Aleksei Remizov*. Paris, the author, 1960. 331 pp.

MAZOUR, ANATOLE. *Rise and Fall of the Romanovs*. Princeton, N. J., Van Nostrand, 1960. 189 pp. \$1.25.

Oxford Regional Economic Atlas. *The U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe*. London, Oxford University Press, 1956. 134 pp.

Population Trends in Eastern Europe, The U.S.S.R. and Mainland China. N. Y., Milbank Memorial Fund, 1960. 336 pp. \$2.00.

REAVEY, G. (Ed.) *Fourteen Great Short Stories by Soviet Authors*. N. Y., Avon Books, 1959. 224 pp. 50¢.

ROGER, HANS. *National Consciousness in Eighteenth Century Russia*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1960. 319 pp. \$6.75.

RUGGLES, M. and MOSTEKY, V. *Russian and East European Publications in the Libraries of the United States*. N. Y., Columbia University Press, 1960. 396 pp. \$10.00.

"Russian Intelligentsia, The." *Daedalus*. Cambridge, Mass., Summer, 1960. [Essays on Pre-revolutionary and Soviet Intelligentsia] 670 pp. \$1.25.

SAPOSS, D. *Communism in American Politics*. Washington, D. C., Public Affairs Press, 1960. 259 pp. \$5.00.

SELZNICK, PHILIP. *The Organizational Weapon. A Study of Bolshevik Strategy and Tactics*. The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1960. 350 pp. \$6.00.

SPIRIDOVICH, A. I. *Velikaya voina: Fevral'skaya Revolutsiya*. [The Great War and the February Revolution] N. Y., All-Slavic Publishing House, 1960. 309 pp.

TERTZ, ABRAM. *The Trial Begins*. Transl. by Max Haywood. N. Y., Pantheon, 1960. 128 pp. \$2.95.

TOMASIC, D. A. *National Communism and Soviet Strategy*. Washington, D. C., Public Affairs Press, 1960. \$4.50.

TURGENEV, IVAN. *Selected Tales*. New Transl. with intr. by David Magarshack. N. Y., Anchor Books, 1960. 335 pp. \$1.45.

ULAM, A. *The Unfinished Revolution*. N. Y., Random House, 1960. 307 pp. \$5.00.

YARMOLINSKY, A. *Literature under Communism*. Bloomington, Indiana, University Research Center, 1960. 165 pp. \$4.00.

"THE RUSSIAN INTELLIGENTSIA"

is the Summer 1960 issue of

DAEDALUS

*Journal of the American Academy
of Arts and Sciences*

PARTIAL CONTENTS

MARTIN MALIA: What is the Intelligentsia?

LEONARD SCHAPIRO: The Pre-Revolutionary Intelligentsia and the Legal Order

BORIS ELKIN: The Russian Intelligentsia on the Eve of the Revolution

RICHARD PIPES: The Historical Evolution of the Russian Intelligentsia

LEOPOLD LABEDZ: The Structure of the Soviet Intelligentsia

DAVID BURG: Observations on Soviet University Students

DOCUMENTS: Philosophy and the Natural Sciences in the USSR. A report of a conference on the philosophical problems of science, Moscow, 1958.

"Dr. Zhivago": Letter to Boris Pasternak from the Editors of *Novy Mir*

LEOPOLD H. HAIMSON: The Solitary Hero and the Philistines

MAX HAYWARD: The Thaw and the Writers

DAVID JORAVSKY: Soviet Scientists and the Great Break

GUSTAV WETTER: Ideology and Science in the Soviet Union

BENJAMIN SCHWARTZ: The Intelligentsia in Communist China

JULIAN MARIAS: The Situation of the Intelligentsia in Spain Today

*"Among the
serious periodicals
of general interest
in this country,
DAEDALUS
stands easily at the
top." —HENRI PEYRE*

DAEDALUS Publication Office, 356 Washington St., Middletown, Conn.

Please enter my subscription to the quarterly DAEDALUS as follows:

.....1 yr. \$5.502 yr. \$10.003 yr. \$14.00

Please send only the issue "The Russian Intelligentsia" at \$1.25.

.....Payment herewithBill me

NAME

ADDRESS

R.R.

Historical Abstracts

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE WORLD'S PERIODICAL LITERATURE
BIBLIOGRAPHIE DES PUBLICATIONS PERIODIQUES MONDIALES
BIBLIOGRAPHIE DER ZEITSCHRIFTENLITERATUR DER WELT
BIBLIOGRAFIA MUNDIAL DE PUBLICACIONES PERIODICAS
БИБЛИОГРАФИЯ МИРОВОЙ ПЕРИОДИЧЕСКОЙ ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

世界各國期刊目錄

MÜNCHEN-SOLLN, EMIL-DITTLER-STRASSE 12, GERMANY

ERIC H. BOEHM, Editor

English summaries of historical articles
(16,860 to date) on the period 1775-1945
from nearly 2,000 periodicals.

Professional and Bibliographical News.

Further information or free Index Number on request

HISTORICAL ABSTRACTS

München-Solln, Emil-Dittler-Strasse 12, Germany

WORLD POLITICS

A Quarterly Journal of International Relations
Under the Editorial Sponsorship of the
CENTER OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Contents, Vol. XIII, No. 1, October 1960

Arms Control: Proposal for a Special Surveillance Force	T. C. Schelling
Swords and Ploughshares: The Turkish Army as a Modernizing Force	Daniel Lerner and Richard D. Robinson
The Role of Traditionalism in the Political Modernization of Ghana and Uganda	David E. Apter
New Constitutional Forms in Africa	Herbert J. Spiro
The Bolshevik Past as the First Secretary Likes It	S. I. Ploss
Comparisons of the United States and USSR National Output: Some Rules of the Game	A. S. Becker

Review Articles

Social Structure and Political Orientation	Talcott Parsons
Perspectives on Personality and Foreign Policy	Herbert McClosky
De Gaulle's Memoirs: The Hero as History	Stanley Hoffmann
The Challenge of Communist China	Robert C. North
The Present and the Press	Bernard C. Cohen

Subscriptions \$6.00 a year (two years, \$10.00), single copies \$2.00

WORLD POLITICS

Woodrow Wilson Hall — Princeton, New Jersey

Statement Required by the Act of August 24, 1912, as
Amended by the Acts of March 3, 1933, and July 2, 1946
and June 11, 1960 (74 Stat. 208) Showing the
Ownership, Management, and Circulation

OF THE RUSSIAN REVIEW published quarterly at Hanover, N. H., additional entry
Deep River, Conn., for October 1, 1960.

1. The names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business
managers are: Publisher, The Russian Review, Inc., 235 Baker Library, Hanover, N. H.;
Editor, Dimitri von Mohrenchildt, 235 Baker Library, Hanover, N. H.; Managing editor,
none; Business manager, none.

2. The owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated
and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or
holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the
names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partner-
ship or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each indi-
vidual member, must be given.)

The Russian Review, Inc., 235 Baker Library, Hanover, N. H. Voluntary, non-stock
corporation.

3. The known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding
1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (if there
are none, so state.) None.

4. Paragraphs 2 and 3 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder
appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the
name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting; also the statements
in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circum-
stances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not ap-
pear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity
other than that of a bona fide owner.

5. The average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed,
through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the 12 months preceding
the date shown above was 800.

DIMITRI VON MOHRENSCHILD
Editor

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 12th day of September, 1960.

GORDON H. GLIDDON, Notary Public.

(My commission expires Oct. 15, 1962)

Prokofiev

Israel V. Nestyev. Foreword by Nicolas Slonimsky. The first
complete biography of Prokofiev to be published in English.
It is certain to be the main source of information on Prokofiev
and his music. Complete list of works. Illustrated with photo-
graphs and musical examples. \$8.75

Central Planning in Czechoslovakia

ORGANIZATION FOR GROWTH IN A MATURE ECONOMY

Jan M. Michal. Czechoslovakia during the first decade of Com-
munist control. Its economy compared with Western market
economies. \$5.75

Order from your bookstore, please

STANFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

